

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF THE
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
OCTOBER, 1878.

ARTICLE I.

HOW SHALL WE TRAIN THE MINISTRY FOR THE TIMES?

By REV. JAMES W. RICHARD, Professor in Carthage College,
Carthage, Ills.

In giving answers to the above question, I shall not be guided by any standard of ministerial training now obtaining either in our own or in any other Church; neither shall I advocate any chimerical or utopian scheme, but I shall urge such a scheme of training as is clearly within the limits of possibility, such a scheme as the Church can readily furnish, and as the average mind can easily compass. I shall advocate such a system of training as will give the ministry true commanding power in the realm of mind and thought, and as will secure to the Church the one indispensable mean of meeting the vast demands which the age now imposes upon her. For two things are generally conceded by intelligent Christians, first, that the Church never had a more important work before her than she has at present, and, secondly, that her ministry is not fully adequate to lead in this important work—that they are in need of a special training for which full provision has not yet been made. It is the purpose of this

article to mark out a line of ministerial training, which is to run deeper and to extend farther than anything of the kind which has yet been followed.

I. WE MUST GIVE A MORE THOROUGH TRAINING IN THE NATURAL SCIENCES.

This of course presupposes the ordinary training in mathematics, languages, history and literature, furnished by the best Colleges and Universities, as preliminary and necessary to the facile and successful comprehension of scientific terms, theories, and facts. For experience has clearly shown that those students always, *ceteris paribus*, succeed best in the study of the natural sciences, who have a broad and liberal literary culture, as providing the only true basis for accurate and useful scholarship.

The importance of having the ministry more thoroughly trained in the fundamental principles of the natural sciences, arises from the fact, that the greatest opposition to religion, both natural and revealed, comes from the scientific investigators of the age, who, dazzled by their brilliant discoveries in the physical world, have their eyes closed to the invisible things of creation, even the eternal power and Godhead, and who are therefore trying to undermine or destroy the foundations of our confidence in the God of Nature and of Revelation. These investigators have, unquestionably, accumulated vast masses of scientific facts, and have made certain grand and most startling generalizations in regard to the universality of law, and the correlation and conservation of the physical forces. Then, applying the rules, the balance, and the scalpel to the study of mind and spirit, because the subtle substance cannot be measured, or weighed, or dissected, they boldly assert that mind and spirit nowhere exist as separate entities, or as independent, self-existent forces.

Here begins the conflict. Christianity recognizes God as the supreme, absolute Spirit, and the human soul as an imperishable substance, distinct from and controlling matter. Materialism knows only matter and laws. Hence the sneers of the scientists at revelation, their challenges, their attitude

of war, their determination to sweep the Bible and the religion of Christ from the earth, and to substitute for them the deification of law and the worship of the Grand Etre, who is defined by M. Comte as the "continuous resultant of all the forces capable of voluntarily concurring in the universal perfectioning of the world, not forgetting our worthy auxiliaries, the animals."

Now the Church must either leave these atheists and materialists in undisputed possession of the field, or she must train her teachers to meet them. But they must not be met by rant, assertion and dogmatism, but by calm and deliberate argument, by clear and intelligent apprehension of the subject in dispute, and with keen analysis of the sophistries of the enemy; that is, every minister of the Gospel should have some acquaintance with the entire field of the natural sciences, that he may understand both the strength and the weakness of the foe, and know where and when to strike, and where and when to let alone. Even the average practical pastor should know enough about the errors and pretensions of modern materialistic skepticism, and the principles and facts of true science, to be able to resolve the doubts and answer the objections of honest inquirers after the truth, instead of turning them away with that cold indifference, which often transforms doubt into unbelief, and unbelief into open rupture with faith.

As a hundred years ago Christianity was mainly attacked by Deism, and a little later by Rationalism, so to-day it is ominously threatened by the materialism of false science, which resolves all mind into matter, and all thought and feeling and faith into chemical and molecular action of matter.* Originating in Germany, this philosophy first passed into England, where it poisoned and corrupted many of the best

* Prof. Huxley denies that he is a materialist, but confesses to the use of a "materialistic terminology," and adopts a "physical basis" of life and mind. Prof. Bain believes in only "one substance, with two sets of properties, two sides,—the physical side and the mental side, a double-faced unity. Moleschot says, "thought is a motion of matter." For refutation, see Cook's *Lectures on Biology*.

minds in church and state and school. Thence it came across the Atlantic into America, and is now being promulgated from Maine to California, in lay sermons and popular lectures, in novels and newspaper articles, in songs and poems, until it forms a very large part of the intellectual pabulum of a very large part of our population. In the words of Dr. Park, "Objections coming from men of science are now diffused among the people. Treatises written for German philosophers are now translated for American mechanics. The thoughts of German Pantheists are distilled into American essays and poems. The reverence of men for the truth is imperiled by the skeptical inquiries into even the human virtues of our Redeemer. The assaults upon the truth will probably become more and more frequent and ingenious. Foreigners have come to our shores at the rate of a thousand a day, and will come at a more fearful rate. An unprecedented number of them will be trained scholars. Many of them will be Neologists, Pantheists, Atheists. In this home of free thought and free speech they will have an influence. This influence must not be resisted by men who declaim against, but by men who reason against, Neology, Pantheism, Atheism. Our young clergymen must be trained not to make a noise about these errors,—'a bishop must be apt to teach, no striker, no brawler,'—but to understand these errors and to meet them as *Greek* meets *Greek*."

Although written ten years ago, much of this language has been translated into actual fact. Within the last six years we have had Tyndall, Büchner, Huxley, and others, teaching atheism to American audiences and striving to inspire contempt for all religion. We have had the Prayer Test, the Delmonico utterances, the Belfast Speech, the Johns Hopkins' Inaugural. We have with us Prof. Youmans and Prof. Draper, the American disciples of these foreign atheists, and a more than half atheistic secular press popularizing godless science and scattering its poison over the land. We have the *Atlantic Monthly*, the *Popular Science Monthly*, et *id omne genus*, distilling German Neology and Pantheism, and English Atheism and Materialism, into almost all of our pe-

ridical literature. We have school directors and superintendents of public instruction, who are expelling the Bible from the public schools and opening a regular crusade* against all school books which contain the name of *God*, or of *Christ*, or of the *Holy Ghost*. We have professors in our Colleges and Universities, who are teaching our young men and women to ignore the God who made them and the Christ who redeemed them.† Now we would lay no embargo or restraint on scientific investigation, nor on the teaching of science, (for that is what we are pleading for), nor would we utter a word in opposition to the great heroes of science, either living or dead, nay, we hail them with applause and bid them a hearty God-speed, for whoever investigates the realms of nature and discovers her laws, is the friend and benefactor of man. But we do most decidedly object to leaving a monopoly of science in the hands of those who use it for the destruction of the other institutions of God. We do object to having these men use the works of God to overthrow His word. We do object to letting this vast army of enemies to the Church go on in the business of robbing the people of their faith in God, and of sowing the seeds of irreligion in the minds of our youth. We do object to having history repeat itself in another Reign of Terror, because we have avowed infidelity in America as the people did in France a century ago.

* It is but a short time since this was done in Chicago.

† The writer has been assured by the most competent witnesses, that many of our western universities and state schools are "regular hot-beds" of atheism and materialism—so much so that even some students have recoiled from them and expressed disgust at the tendency. In one case a learned professor, a Lutheran clergyman, was called to account by a colleague for emphasizing the "blood" of Christ in reading the Scriptures, and has been attacked by the secular press for "teaching science from a religious standpoint." Ought not these facts to open the eyes of the Church and of Christian parents, and start the inquiry, whether it is safe to leave the education of the youth in the hands of the state, where they are left without instruction in the duties they owe to God and their own souls? Does not a PRACTICAL equipment for life include some knowledge of God and the human soul?

But how shall the danger be met? Certainly not by pious cant and declamation. We can meet it effectually only through the Church, by having the ministry enter into the enemy's camp and, seizing his arms and treasures, turn them against him. In order to do this, the Church must have the very best training schools, which she must keep in active operation at all times for the express purpose of qualifying men for this service. As evidently, for much time to come, the Church will have to contend with the encroachments of false science, the duty now devolves upon her to prepare to defend herself, not principally with the dogmas of revelation, which would be of little service in this contest, but mainly with arguments and facts drawn from a sound philosophy and a true science. That is, the Church should not only train her ministers in theology, but she should give them the additional advantage of the power and influence to be derived from scientific truth, since all truth is self-consistent and has its source in God, and can be used for God's glory. Too long has it been said, and with too much justice, that the ministry has been indifferent and even hostile to the study of the natural sciences. It is time they were throwing off this reproach and entering into this goodly land themselves, not that they may flourish from the pulpit the language and deal in the technicalities of the schools; not that they may preach physics, or chemistry, or geology, or botany; but that they may at least turn the legitimate and proper conclusions from these sciences to the defence and illustration of the truth of Revelation, that like Christ and his apostles, in many of their most beautiful and sublime discourses, they may make an intelligent use of the things which men see around them for imparting and impressing spiritual instruction. Neither would we have the minister of the gospel charge his mind with the minutiae of science, nor spend in original and extended research the time that should be given to the practical duties of the pulpit, or of the parish, but we would have him understand the fundamental principles and acquainted with scientific methods, that he may be able to distinguish the true from the false.

Thirty years ago Hugh Miller said: "The battle of the Evidences will have as certainly to be fought on the field of the physical sciences, as it was contested in the last age on that of the metaphysics. And on this new arena the combatants will have to employ new weapons, which it will be the privilege of the challenger to choose."* It is needless to say that this prophecy has been fulfilled. We are now in the heat of the battle. The conflict is going on all round us. It is becoming sharper and sharper, and will be longer or shorter in proportion to the celerity shown by the challenged party in learning to use the enemy's weapons and in acquiring his mode of warfare. The old weapons of the eighteenth century will not answer in this new conflict, any more than the old flint-lock muskets and blunderbusses of our revolutionary fathers, would answer against modern needle-guns and Sharp's rifles. If we would insure victory in the battle of the Evidences, we must be armed as the enemy is armed. Our leaders must study in the same schools and be trained on the same ground as the enemy. And on the day of conflict they must have in their hands the same weapons which the enemy brings against them—that is, the same scientific facts and a knowledge of the same great laws of nature. Having this equality of training and of implements, together with the advantage of being able to plant her feet upon the everlasting Rock, the Church will soon gain the victory and win a large spoil of truth. In some part, this has already been done. Astronomy has shown that the heavens do declare the glory of God, and geology, that of old He laid the foundations of the earth, and chemistry, that the very elements of matter have been weighed and measured and adjusted with infinite precision†.

The charge has often been made against the Bible by the infidel and atheistic science of the day, that it is an antiqua-

* See "Foot-prints of the Creator."

† See Art. IX. in "Scribner's Monthly," April, 1878; also Dr. Tayler Lewis' Special Introduction to the First Chapter of Genesis in Lange's Commentary; also Essay of Prof. Guyot of Princeton, printed in the Proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance, 1873; also,

ted book, which is far behind the age, and that it must be either corrected or supplemented by the discoveries of modern science. This charge could be made by those only who are ignorant of the spirit, the aim, and the material contents of the Bible, and who, like Hume, have never attentively read it, and yet presume to sit in judgment upon it. The Bible is not indeed a book on natural sciences, and yet it contains the germs and elements of all true science. In Geology, Moses is older than either Hutton or Werner; in Astronomy, Job and Isaiah far antedate Copernicus, Galileo and Newton; and in Natural History, we have Solomon speaking of plants and beasts and creeping things when the land of Linnæus was yet a swamp of the German Ocean, and the birth-place of Cuvier was a howling wilderness. And it could be easily shown that the Bible is the forerunner of all true modern science, and that its authors are the teachers of all subsequent ages, and that their deliverances will harmonize with all the facts and actual discoveries of science; and what is of scarcely less importance, that the great pioneers and promoters of almost every branch of modern science, have been guided by the star of faith.*

Now it is the duty of the Church—a duty she owes to her Founder, herself and to the world—to have her religious teachers come to the preaching of the Gospel with the clear and strong conviction as the result of the actual study of both the word and the works of God, that there is no conflict between the utterances of His lips and the creation of His hands. It is the duty of the Church to require that her teachers know not only the doctrines of the Bible, but also the objections raised against them. It is her duty to make

God Revealed in Nature and in Christ, Book One, by James B. Walker. These are all very valuable monographs, that should be studied by every one interested in the relation of cosmical and other physical subjects to the Bible.

* "It is delightful," says Mallet, "to see how such heroes of science as Copernicus and Kepler, as Baco de Verulam, Newton, Haller, Buckland, etc., bow in lowest reverence before Revelation, whilst the light troops file by without so much as removing their hats."

them all able to distinguish between the facts and principles of true science and the conjectures and assumptions of false science, whence come the "oppositions" to revealed religion. For, unquestionably, one of the prime wants of the Church to-day, is a larger number of men of intellect and thorough training, who will throw themselves into the broad deep gulf which yawns between faith and modern culture, and who, by their learning and science, will help to fill up the mighty chasm, and to construct upon it a royal highway for the more speedy coming of the King. The Church wants more men, who will see in every opening flower, in the revolving seasons, in the rolling planet, in life in death, in every natural phenomenon, something more than a mere succession of orderly changes, or the operation of blind unintelligent forces. She wants men who will see behind all these mighty moving masses of matter, behind all laws and changes, the wise intellect, the strong hand and the benevolent will, of the great Creator, who clothes the lilies with beauty, takes care of the sparrow, and makes the sun to shine by day and the moon and the stars to give light by night. She also wants men, who are more fully abreast with the current of infidel and materialistic thought, and who are therefore prepared to assist in a profounder comprehension and a more scientific vindication of Christianity. To raise up and qualify such a ministry, is clearly within her power, and, therefore, it becomes her duty, to address herself to the task.*

* There is a deep conviction among the more intelligent and wide-awake junior clergy, that in our theological seminaries too much time is given to the dissection of old and long exploded heresies and errors, and by far too little to the consideration of the living questions of the day. An examination of catalogues from leading theological seminaries makes the impression that there is reason for this conviction. From many I select three: Princeton has seven professors and one assistant; Andover, seven professors, one assistant, and three lecturers; but neither of them has either a professorship or a lectureship on the relations of science to theology. Gettysburg has three professors and one lecturer on the "Relations of Science and Revelation, who, as we happen to know, delivers a VERY FEW lectures each year. Other cat-

II. WE MUST PROVIDE AMPLER TRAINING IN MENTAL PHILOSOPHY.

Necessitated by the very constitution of our nature to philosophize, and surrounded by circumstances which compel us to inquire into the causes and relations of things, it is of the highest importance that he who assumes to be the spiritual guide of others, should himself understand something of the phenomena of spirit, and of the laws which regulate and govern his own spiritual faculties and those of others. Psychological studies, therefore, are of great practical use to the minister of the Gospel as giving him command of his own mind and of the mind of others. But they have also a far higher value in the prolegomena of theological studies, as furnishing the gateway to proper theistic conceptions, and as leading to a correct anthropology. Our ideas of God as an intelligent, moral and spiritual Being, are, in large part, derived from the ideas and conceptions we have of the faculties and operations of our own spirits. We are conscious of possessing intelligence, a moral sense, a rational soul, a free will. These are discovered to be different from matter, and not to be governed by its laws. Then comes the question, Whence these attributes? They must have a cause. That cause

alogues make, in general, a less favorable showing as to the extent and comprehensiveness of the curriculum. From correspondence and personal observation, we learn that many of the questions of the day are incidentally discussed in various connections throughout the course, but that they receive no special, systematic, thorough and comprehensive treatment—that they are brought in rather as side issues, and, consequently, an impression is made upon the minds of students that these questions are of secondary importance. In this respect we are behind the Free Church of Scotland, which, in the Edinburgh College, (theological), has a professorship of "Natural Science," and requires students to attend one recitation in that department every day throughout the entire Junior year. The Glasgow College has a lectureship of Natural Science of the same extent and requirements as the professorship at Edinburgh.

We respectfully call the attention of those having the charge of theological education, to this manifold deficiency, and ask them to consider the importance of immediately providing ampler facilities for the study of the connection between the Physical Sciences and Revelation.

must itself have these qualities, *i. e.*, must be intelligent, free, and have moral discernment. Then, by combining these conceptions with our ideas of infinite time and space, we reach the conclusion that God is a Being infinite in all His attributes. This is the starting point—the *terminus a quo*—of Theology, of the *λόγος περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. But he who has never studied the operations of his own mind, and knows little or nothing of the laws of the human spirit and of the method by which the reason advances from premises to conclusions, must always remain deficient or in error in his conceptions of the Divine Spirit. He may be assured in his own mind of the existence of the Divine Spirit, he may feel and know that there is a God, but he will fail in presenting the strong and clear argument for the conviction of others.

Now the question of the existence and attributes of the Divine Being, which we have said is the initial point of theology, evidently involves some of the nicest shades of Psychological distinction. For we find that the definitions which philosophers have given of God, and the notions they have entertained in regard to his attributes, are the exact counterparts of their systems of Psychology. For instance, Kant, imposing certain *a priori* forms and conceptions on mind, reached the conclusion, logically, no doubt, from his premises, that there is no God whose existence can be proved by pure reason. Hamilton, following Kant too closely, and starting with the notion that all knowledge is relative, ends by making God the unconditioned and absolute, whose "existence we are only warranted in assuming as a certain kind of cause necessary to account for a certain state of things." Herbert Spencer, taking up Hamilton's principles, but not restrained by the practical faith of either Kant or Hamilton, has swept God from the region of the knowable, and, for all the practical purposes of faith, has completely annihilated the object of religious reverence and affection, for man can never fear and love that which cannot be known. This brief historical sketch shows the intimate connection between Philosophy and the foundations of Theology, also the evil effects resulting to Theology of reasoning from false data of Phi-

losophy. Had Kant given a Philosophy based upon induction and the testimony of consciousness and the senses, Herbert Spencer had, in all probability, stopped far short of Nihilism.

Now, since men will philosophize and must philosophize, and since all systems of theology and morals are based upon and are more or less shaped by systems of philosophy, the student of theology and the preacher of the Gospel should be well trained in, at least, the fundamental principles of the philosophy of facts and of common sense, and should be made familiar with the history of opinions, that he may be able to distinguish the true from the false, the practical from the transcendental, and that he may know how to address the intellect, to stir the emotions, and to influence the will. And this, not that the preacher should speculate about the revealed doctrines of salvation, or etherealize and mystify the solid and simple truths of the Gospel, but that he may oppose a false philosophy by a true one, and may have an assured basis for the original and independent study of theology, and may not be traced hither and thither by the latest book and the newest system, but that he may have a system of his own, and a reason in the nature of things for the hope he entertains and for the doctrines he promulgates. And as the preacher has much to do with the ethics of theology, that is, the practical duties of religion, the right and wrong in human conduct, he will find that philosophy is none the less important and fundamental on that account. For the notion which a man has of the moral faculty, and of the law by which it is governed, and of the will as bound or free, will always shape his views of responsibility, and of the merit and demerit of human actions in any given case; and, rising higher, they will also affect his view of the Divine Character in its relations to the human subject, and will finally extend to the question of rewards and punishments in the world to come. Hence a correct Psychology is as necessary for a correct, consistent and homogeneous system of morals, as it is for a correct and consistent system of Theology; for in either case we must go back to first principles.

Now, while it is true that only a few men are born with

metaphysical minds, yet all may and can acquire a knowledge of the fundamental facts and principles of Philosophy, as of language, mathematics, and the sciences, and may use them as guide-boards and land-marks in the field of thought for himself, and as weapons against errors of the head and false beliefs of the heart in others. By these means also the preacher will address men through those laws of the mind which must always be obeyed, if we would secure success, for in so far forth as a man speaks in accordance with the laws of his own trained mind, will his words find a ready response from the mind of others, "and God will honor those laws and men will feel that he does not speak as a man, but as a man sent from God, for he will not say, this is what I am inclined to think; this is what a synod of men has sanctioned, but this is reasonable, and what is reasonable, is kingly, and he who despises what is proved, despises not man but God. He that believeth shall have peace, but he that believeth not shall be at war with himself."

Philosophy has sometimes been abused in the pulpit, therefore some have opposed its pursuit altogether by students of Theology. But here, as in all other learning,

"Shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
And drinking deep sobers us again."

It is the small philosophy, the mere smattering that bewilders and leads men astray, and loses them in the mists and fogs of speculation. It is depth in philosophy that delivers men from darkness and shows them the light and clothes them with power. In metaphysical acumen and profundity of thought, President Edwards stood nearly on a level with the mighty Stagirite himself; while the mind of Dr. Chalmers embraced the entire circle of the sciences and was profoundly philosophical, yet they were among the most simple, and altogether the most powerful preachers of their respective times. In great learning, rare mental endowments and wonderful philosophic depth, they joined humble and devout piety and a yearning for souls. Whilst a rich vein of philosophy runs through their sermons, yet it is everywhere

measured by the golden reed of God's sanctuary and made the hand-maiden of Theology. It was simply the instrument by which they pierced men's minds to let in the light and the truth from above. They used it not to make a display or to get a name, but to open a way for the Gospel, holding this latter as the divine Philosophy, which alone can quicken the conscience and sanctify the heart.

What we have said thus far in answer to the question at the head of this article, is, in the main, contemplated and *attempted* by the course of study laid down in the catalogues of our colleges. This course does indeed embrace a wide range of subjects, but the time allowed for their proper pursuit is altogether too short to furnish the training for which we plead and which the age demands. As about nine-tenths of our colleges have been established by the Church, to supply her wants in the matter of the ministry, and as she can hope to reap only what she sows, so should her representatives arrange the course of study with sole reference to her wants, with the view of providing the broadest and most liberal culture. When our American college curriculum was established, one to two centuries ago, many of the sciences now looming into prominence and claiming a place in every system of liberal training, were almost, or altogether, unknown. Then, four years with Latin, Greek, Mathematics and a little science, were enough to train men for the service of the Church. But now the curriculum of our colleges has become very large and is receiving additions almost every year, but the qualifications for admission remain about the same as at the beginning, and only four years are given to complete the course. The result is, that we have a low standard of scholarship, and the degrees of A. B. and A. M., which once indicated at least respectable attainment in literature, science and philosophy, now give no assurance of anything beyond the most meagre superficiality. According to our present methods of education, something is gained in breadth, but much is lost in depth. A consequence is, that running with so much haste and rapidity over so wide a field, we fail rightly to develop and strengthen the higher facul-

ties of the mind. We cultivate the memory, but we do not properly stimulate thought. Hence it can no longer be questioned that our American colleges, with all their appliances and numerous professors, tend to produce *accomplishments*, rather than thoughtful, contemplative and accurate scholarships. Students, in many instances, do not have time to form a taste or a fondness for any one pursuit, nor are they brought to understand what learning means. They do not enter into the spirit of anything. Hence the great majority of young men who have graduated at college, never think of reading a page of Latin or Greek, or of opening a book of science or philosophy, after the day they received the coveted parchment. The reason is, that many of them have not familiarity enough with any of these subjects to relieve the study of them from the merest drudgery. They fall into a routine of professional study or of business, and are very soon behind the age. They do not refresh their minds from the wide fields of science and standard literature, they do not rouse their intellects by grappling with the deep problems of philosophy, all because, in many instances, the college training was too shallow and superficial to awaken a love and form a proper taste for these studies. Now what is needed in order to furnish the Church an efficient ministry, is not less Latin, or Greek, or Mathematics, but vastly more science and philosophy.* Instead of four years in college we need and should have *six*. Instead of a smattering of Geology, Chemistry and Physics, and a hasty perusal of one small book on Mental Philosophy and Logic, we should have our young men who are in training for the Church, look back of the superficial phenomena of matter and mind, to a careful and systematic study of the great laws and principles which condition all phenomena and connect them with God. Above all things, the Church wants more men who can think independently, originally, and coherently on these great living subjects, which are enter-

* In Philosophy and Logic we are far behind the English and Scotch Universities.

ing as most important factors into the civilization and religion of our times. She wants men, too, who have not the verdancy and inexperience of youth, but the wisdom and prudence of a trained and cultured manhood. In order to supply these wants, the Church must first repress the ardor, with which half-educated and even uneducated young men are striving to force their way into the ministry; and, secondly, she must lay down a course of study which will best suit her own great interests, and which will always be the broadest and most liberal possible—a course which will give, first, severe and correct discipline as the paramount requisite of an education, and, secondly, which will embrace a wide range of facts and principles. Then when she has provided in her colleges the very best means for full and thorough training, she should urge the completion of the course upon all who aspire to minister at her altars. Even against the protest, sometimes raised, that young men are burning with zeal to get into the field, and are losing much valuable time by protracted study, the Church should insist that the best economy of time is time spent in extended and thoughtful preparation, as quality of service is more important than quantity, and as one great want of the Church is not mere preaching, but better preaching. And indeed both are quality improved and quantity increased, when the workman is thoroughly skilled in the use of his implements, and is master of his trade, since it is not the disorderly and random strokes, however hard they may be, but the orderly and well-directed ones, which produce the best and most lasting results. *Miles, Feri faciem*, shouted Cæsar at the great battle of Pharsalia. This made him master of the Roman world. It is the strokes of the preacher that are directed intelligently at the vulnerable places, which will win the victory.

Bearing in mind that nine-tenths of our Universities and Colleges exist for and by the Church, it becomes an important question, whether these institutions are fully meeting the wants of the Church. For one, we answer, No. The training is too limited and superficial. It covers subjects enough, but it does not extend far enough into these subjects. We

have multiplied Colleges so rapidly, and seem so ambitious to place diplomas in the hands of the greatest possible number, that we have, to a large extent, lost sight of the true object of education. Certain it is, that we have not kept up a high standard of scholarship, and have justly exposed ourselves to not a little criticism from educators and scholars across the Atlantic. Hence, no wonder that Presidents Eliot, White, *et alii*, are attacking the "small Colleges," which seem indeed to be *huckstering* education rather than *educating*. Now, such a course of academic study as we have briefly indicated, and which we believe to be altogether possible, would furnish the proper preliminary training for the more successful and profitable study of theology. Less than this cannot cut off sciolism and come up to the full measure of the Church's wants. With less than this the Church may indeed maintain her existence and still do a grand work, but she cannot meet her great responsibility.

But we have not yet given the final answer to our question. It is,

III. BY MAKING THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION MORE GENERAL AND THOROUGH.

The training of the College can only lay the foundation on which the professional superstructure is to be erected. The real and final qualification of the preacher, consists in his systematic and thorough acquaintance with the great doctrines of the Bible, that he may know how to divide the word of truth, and how to teach the one only way of salvation. The New Testament idea of preaching is nothing else than the presentation of doctrines. This is seen in all the discourses of the Master in unfolding the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, and also in the discourses of the apostles, as witness Peter on the day of Pentecost and before Cornelius, and Paul at Salamis "preaching the word of God," at Thessalonica "reasoning out the Scriptures," at Athens, the very metropolis of classical refinement, "preaching Jesus and the resurrection," and from the "midst of Mars Hill" setting

forth that sublime vindication of the personality, sovereignty and spirituality of God,* at Ephesus, "disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God," everywhere, indeed, "testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." It was always the *doctrines*. The same thing appears also in the apostolic epistles. They are the unfolding of the great plan of salvation, as taught by Jesus Christ, in fulfilment of type and shadow and prophecy. But the great deficiency in the preaching of to-day, is in the element of theology. *Much of it has but little foundation in the word of God.* Much of it, especially in our cities, is a weak and emasculated kind of morality, which makes the hearers thereof little or no wiser in the matter of their relations to God. There is also among the people a morbid craving for something new and striking, something that will please the fancy or flatter the vanity. The demand has produced the supply, and, instead of the great doctrines of God, presented in plain and popular language, we have too often essays and declamations, which, for all the purposes of awakening the fear and love of God, or of producing faith in Christ, or of stimulating to a virtuous and holy life, might be supplanted by a chapter from Aristotle's *Ethics*, or Cicero's *Offices*, or by a poem from Tennyson or Lowell.† It is on this account that many are weak and sickly, and many sleep, and that the pulpit has lost much of the influence and power which it once enjoyed. Often a text is taken from the Bible and is made the heading or motto of what is called a sermon, but the discourse itself is something so foreign to the thought and spirit of the text, and contains so little of the real marrow of the Gospel, that whole acres of such would not conduct a lost soul into the way of salvation.

The only way, as we see, by which this evil can be corrected and the pulpit put in possession of its lost prestige, and be made to rise again to that influence which once it com-

* See Lange on Acts.

† The writer knows of a pulpit in which the evening service often consists mainly of readings from the poets.

manded, and which it ought always to command, is to give our candidates for the ministry a more thorough training in *systematic divinity*, that they may know what the *doctrines* are, and that they may be able to state them more clearly, and to press them with more vigor upon the reason and consciences of their hearers.

The feeling against doctrinal preaching is one of the mawkish sentimentalities of the day. People call for sermons on moral and social subjects, but dislike to hear of sin and holiness, death, judgment and hell. But no preaching is preaching, which does not tell the whole truth about God, and enforce all duties, moral, social and religious, with a "thus saith the Lord." This gives preaching its authority and makes men fear and obey. But only they who know by systematic study what the doctrines are, can present them as they ought to be presented. And yet in some places we are allowing young men to press into this great and responsible work of preaching the Gospel, who have only the most limited, and in some cases, no theological training. We have men in our ministry to-day, (and in this respect we are not different from other churches), who cannot state systematically and defend scientifically a single fundamental doctrine of the divine word. Many who fail or despair of success in other pursuits, imagine they have a special vocation to preach the Gospel, and, accordingly, present themselves for ordination, and then go forth on the grandest commission that ever employed the talents and faculties of man, both without the discipline necessary to secure coherent thought, and without sufficient knowledge of the word of God to protect themselves from all kinds of looseness in practice and error in doctrine. Hence the disorderly character of some congregations, and the little regard paid to the decisions of ecclesiastical judicatories. We sow the wind, we reap the whirlwind.

We seem sometimes to lose sight of the fact that the subjects of theology are the profoundest that can engage the mind and study of man, that they relate to God, the Incarnate Word, the Holy Ghost, the human soul, sin, judgment,

eternity, that even an angel might stand appalled before any one of these subjects, and so we often admit young men to the handling and exposition of these great themes, who cannot even give acceptable definitions to the words, much less would they be able to teach the doctrines with any tolerable degree of accuracy. The truth is, that while the clergy has in all ages been in possession of the great mass of the profoundest learning, there has always been found in its ranks the greatest amount of slender *professional* training. It is undeniable, that men are ordained and sent forth to preach the everlasting Gospel, who, if they bore the same relation to the study of medicine, or the law, could not obtain admission to the college of physicians, or to the bar of the courts. The learned professions of the law and of medicine carefully guard themselves from professional ignorance and charlatantry, but the ministry, with objects and aims infinitely higher, has *maintained* no just and adequate standard of qualification for admission into her ranks. It is true the constitution of our Synods requires that each candidate for the sacred office shall be examined in the original languages of the inspired Scriptures, Theology, Church History, Pastoral Theology, Homiletics, and Church Government. This comprehends a large amount of professional training, but it does not go beyond the wants of the Church. Nor does the constitution make provision for a less amount, but it expressly says that the examination shall embrace *at least* these subjects. But we know that in some of our synods this rule has been honored quite as frequently in the breach as in the observance. The writer has been witness to the fact that men have been brought into the ministry, who not only could not sustain an examination on any of these subjects, but who could not even speak and write the English language with propriety. Now if it be said that strict adherence to this rule adopted by the synods, would have excluded from the ministry many men who have done good service, yea, in some instances, even better service than many who have come up to the full measure of the requirements, we reply, first, that if it would have excluded some useful and very successful men

from the ministry who are now in it, it would doubtless have given us many young men of good talents and fine scholarship, who have been kept out of the ministry by the unfavorable impressions made by some unworthy representatives, and, secondly, that we are making no attack upon those of our brethren whose qualifications for their work are limited, and who have done the best they could, but we are finding fault with the synods who have been unfaithful to the Church, and unfaithful to those very brethren, in that they did not provide for them the means of thorough preparation, but suffered them in their zeal without knowledge to enter the ministry to their own and the Church's great detriment. It is with the synods and the men who *know* better, that the blame must rest, and from this source the remedy must come. And if it be said that there is danger of quenching the operations of the Spirit, and of putting a call to the ministry on a level with secular business, then we reply, that the Spirit never operates except through the word, and that this call to the ministry comes through the Church, which has the word, and that in choosing a minister, the word should be our guide. But the inspired word, neither by precept nor by example, justifies ignorance in the ministry. The Saviour had his disciples under him three years and a half, during which He taught them the things pertaining to the kingdom, and then endowed them with the gift of all tongues, and the special power of the Holy Ghost, who would lead them in the way of all truth and bring to their minds whatsoever He Himself had spoken to them. Here we have an example of professional training for the ministry, which can never be gainsaid, but which must guide us to the end of time. Take the case of Paul, who was educated in the famous schools of Tarsus and at the feet of Gamaliel. Before he was permitted to enter the apostolate, he must spend three years in the solitudes of Arabia. Take the companions of Paul, Timothy, who had known the Scriptures from childhood, Apollos, "a learned man," Barnabas, son of prophecy, or hear Paul's instructions about the selection of ministers, "Apt to teach," "Not a novice," "Able by sound doctrine to exhort and con-

vince the gainsayers;" or listen to his sharp and pungent rebukes against ignorance, shallowness, prating, and "vain babblings," and surely we will find in all this small reason for trying to justify our mistakes by appealing to our fears of offending the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost makes no mistakes, but we have made mistakes, and that, simply, because we have not heeded the *word* through which the Holy Ghost breathes and operates. Nor does the fact that there is great need of men, justify the lowering of the standard of qualifications. When Christ called the attention of His disciples to the fields white unto the harvest, he did not bid them go and cast in the sickle, but to *pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth reapers*. As for themselves, they must abide the time of their preparation. A little less haste and a little more prayer, on our part, and the Church will not lack an able and well-qualified ministry.

Now, if against all this it be said that a highly educated ministry will be tempted to preach great sermons, then I reply, That is what the Church and the world need. They need great sermons filled with the great doctrines of God's word. The principal deficiency of this age is, that there are not great sermons enough, that men are not sufficiently instructed in the grand and soul-stirring doctrines of the nature and attributes of God, his holiness, justice, love, and mercy, in the doctrines of sin, the incarnation, the atonement, justification. If these things be realities, with which men will have to do, both here and hereafter, then the more they hear and know of them the better. Great preaching is nothing else than the faithful heralding of the eternal verities of God with freshness and vigor of thought, with simplicity of language and aptness of illustration. Only those who have clearly apprehended these verities, can set them forth intelligently and forcibly. They who conceive of them darkly, will express them in misty and uncertain language, which may leave men's souls in doubt or in error.

As our schools and colleges are diffusing popular intelligence and producing independence of thought, as many are running to and fro, as knowledge is increasing and wicked-

ness abounding, what is needed from the pulpit is more of the sincere milk and strong meat of God's word, that men's consciences may be quickened and their thirst for knowledge gratified. The Church and the times need more *intellectual* preachers, who, like Christ and the apostles, will rouse and stimulate thought—preachers who will reach men's hearts and stir their wills by enlightening their minds and informing their judgments—preachers who will not deal in platitudes, nor relate anecdotes, nor pander to the corrupt and vitiated tastes of a novel-reading and sensation-loving audience, but who will hurl forth the solid truths of God's word as hard as cannon-balls. The Church and the times need men who can thunder from Sinai or plead in tenderest tones of love from Calvary—men who can speak to the king on his throne, or to the peasant in his hut, and who can rebuke sin in high places, and in low, with all long-suffering and *doctrine*. There is great need of men who can take care of the flock of God and rule over the Church. There is need of more strictly *professional* work in our churches, performed by men who know the duties of their profession, and who have been taught by the best masters how to perform them. All this is what the age needs, instead of the loose doctrine, and sentimental declamation, and moral cowardice, and lax government, which lull men's consciences, and please their fancies, and connive at their sins, and let the churches run into disorder.

And if this be the objection to thorough theological training, then, for the sake of the Church and the good of dying men, let us have more of it; let us make every preacher a theologian; let us follow the example of the Master and His inspired apostles in the selection of religious teachers, and send into the pulpit only men who hold fast the faithful word of God as it hath been *taught* them, that they may be able, by sound *doctrine*, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayer.

So much have we said of the importance of theological training in general. But, as Lutherans, we dare not ignore the great doctrinal system of our own Church, unquestiona-

bly the grandest, the most complete, and the most evangelical in the world. Its Confession stands notably at the head of all Protestant theology. Of it the learned Dr. Schaff has said: "It is the only Confession on which all Protestants could unite." Of our symbols in general, it may be said that they form the best body of divinity, so far as they go, in the whole range of theological literature, and that after three hundred years, they stand above refutation. They may not in every particular be *absolutely* perfect, but next to the Bible, the Book of Concord* contains more sound theology, more practical soul-comforting truth, and more reverence of spirit, than any other volume that has ever been written by man. Hence the theology that is based upon it is the ruling theology of the world. New England talks a great deal about German theology, and sends her theologians across the waters to study it. But we all know that the theology of Germany is nothing more or less than the theology of the Lutheran Confessions, and that the great theologians of Germany, both past and present, with only rare exceptions, have been and are Lutherans.† Therefore we have a heritage and a birth-right in German theology which we ought not to surrender to another. Indeed we can no longer afford that our students for the ministry, and our people, shall receive their knowledge of Lutheran theology from Buck's Theological Dictionary, Watson's Institutes, and Shedd's History of Doc-

* This book ought to be in the hands of every Lutheran minister, and yet the writer knows whole synods in which not above two or three copies can be found. Young men leave some of our theological seminaries who have scarcely heard the names of the great dogmatists, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Quenstedt. We have been so ambitious of being not very different from other people, that we have been in danger of losing our identity and forgetting our history.

† It is not a little humiliating to see such works as Martensen's Dogmatic introduced to English readers with a caution against its Lutheranism, and to find other Lutheran books in which the ecclesiastical status of the authors is purposely ignored, and, as has recently been the case, one from which the Lutheran sentiments have been expurgated and their place supplied with Calvinistic sentiments. Is this honest? Is it Christian?

trines, but from the original sources of our theology, now accessible to every Lutheran, either in the originals or in trustworthy translations. We need to have the young men in our theological seminaries more deeply imbued with the spirit of the AUGUSTANA, from which Arndt drew his True Christianity, and Spener and Francke the means of breaking the iron bands of the dead orthodoxy of the seventeenth century, and upon the Fourth Article of which Harms planted his cannon when he thundered against Rationalism, in 1817. This Confession is, and will ever remain, the great thesaurus of Protestantism, and the mightiest bulwark against Rome. Fidelity to the past, and a wise policy for the future of our Church in this country where, on the list of Protestant denominations, we stand third, demands from us a more careful indoctrination of our young clergy in the principles, doctrines and practices of the fathers, that they may be made more Lutheran without being less Christian, more denominational without being less liberal and catholic; for spiritual Christianity and broad Catholicity are of the very essence of genuine Lutheranism. This is one of the duties laid upon us in answering the question, How shall *we* train the ministry for the times; for if we as a Church have a mission in this country, we can best discharge the duties of that mission by being true to our name, our history, and our antecedents.

ARTICLE II.

ANSGAR.

* Translated from the German of Rev. Alexander Michelsen, of Lübeck, by Rev. G. F. BEHRINGER, Indianapolis, Ind.

Ansgar, (derived from Aasgejr or Osgejr = Oskar, *i. e.* God's spear) is the name of the man, who, celebrated as the Apostle of the North, occupies a prominent position among God's instruments for Christianizing the Germanic nations.

* From "Herzog's Real-Encyclopædia," Vol. I., p. 439—445, 2d Edition.

At the time of Charlemagne, Northern Europe was inhabited by three branches of the North-Germanic races: the Danes, the Swedes, and the Norwegians (Normans or Northmen). Their religion, the so-called "Asa-Faith," was a form of religious belief peculiarly developed under the influence of northern nature and northern national life; its characteristic features were common to all the Germanic peoples. This popular faith or national religion has been preserved in the Old-Norse songs and sagas, committed to writing at an early day in the Old-Norse or Icelandic language, in the so-called Eddas. The older Edda (ancestress or grandmother)—also called Saemund's Edda, after its supposed compiler, Priest Saemund the Learned, about 1200 A. D.—is composed of parts, whose age extends beyond the Christian times, and of sagas, that sprang directly from original heathenism. The younger Edda, or Snorre's Edda, called so after the alleged compiler Snorre Sturleson (died 1241 A. D.), is of later origin and of less importance.

According to the conception of the Northmen, there were in the beginning two worlds: Muspelheim (or Muspilli, *i. e.* the Fire-world) and Niflheim (*i. e.* the Fog-world). The heat from Muspelheim met the cold from Niflheim in the fathomless abyss: Ginnungagap, and from their contact there proceeded the giant Yuce (Yætte), the ancestor of all giants (nature's untamed forces), and of the cow, *Ædhumla*; from the union of the latter two, the gods, or demi-gods, derive their origin.

The most important gods were: Odin, the All-father; Thor, the mighty god of war; Balder, the god of piety, gentleness, and innocence; Njard, controller of the air and of the winds; and Froe, the lord of the rain and of the sunshine; Brage god of song, (the art of the scalds); and Hejmdall, heaven's watchman at the bridge, Bifroest (*i. e.* the rainbow). The most distinguished goddesses were: Frigga, Odin's wife; Froeja, goddess of love; and Iduna; who guards the apples of youth.

The evil-minded Loke caused strife and dissension among the gods. He enticed the blind Hoeder to kill the noble Balder. Thereupon Ragnarøk appears (*i. e.* the great night

of the gods), and the old world passes away. The present condition of things is a state of imperfection and corruption. But out of the sea will finally arise a "new earth," over which a mighty God shall reign. Thus the old Norse mythology begins with a Genesis and closes with an Apocalypse, the promise of a more perfect world.

The belief in the immortality of the soul was received by the Northmen more clearly and more positively than by the majority of other heathen nations. They did not, as did the Greeks, regard the hereafter as a miserable "shadow-life," but rather as an active, stirring life with Odin, consecrated to conflict, in the golden Valhalla. In fact it was the worth of the personality, the development of freedom, of the power of the will and of human activity, upon which the mind of these nations was concentrated—indeed without limit or restraint, often degenerating into adventurous, wild and savage doings, though with a profound ethical tendency, which manifested itself principally as fidelity.

Woman enjoyed great respect in the Northland and the wife was the equal of the husband.

The brotherhood of the clans united the heroes to each other by the tenderest ties of friendship, and bound them to follow one another even unto death.

It was a sacred custom to pour water over a new-born child; so likewise to make "Thor's hammer-sign," the sign of the cross, upon the drinking horn at the meeting of the "guilds." There were therefore not wanting, in the Norse conceptions and usages, types and presentiments of the truths, of such traces of that *λόγος σπερματικός* with which the missionary might connect his message, though indeed there were also not wanting such as did not desire either to hear or to know of any other deity than their own heroic power.

The gods were worshipped under the open sky, at the altar of sacrifice ("Harg"), in part also in the temple ("Gudehove," *i. e.* the court of God), where likewise the pictures of the deities were placed. The most important temples in the North, in which the "Thinge," (courts or councils), were held, were located at Upsala, at Lejre (near Raskilde), and

at Moere, by Trondhjem (Drantheim). The chieftains of the people were at the same time officers in the temple, and, because of the simplicity of the divine service, there was no need of a special priestly class. The great yearly sacrificial festivals (Blot) took place in Spring and Autumn, as well as at the Yule-tide (Winter solstice). But a particularly sacred festival occurred every ninth year. As a rule, animals were sacrificed (horses and cocks), at times human beings (slaves, criminals, and prisoners of war). Indeed, tradition relates, that even kings were offered up by their own people to appease the gods.

The Danes, as well as the Northmen generally, came in contact with Christianity at a very early day; the former on their commercial voyages, the latter in the piratical expeditions of the Vikings. Duerstede (Darstad), situated somewhat north of Utrecht, a city much frequented by northern traders, afforded hereunto special opportunity. And the report concerning the "white Christ" was spread over the entire North.

The first missionary, that ventured to cross the much-dreaded boundary line of the Danes, was Willebrard of Northumberland. Dedicated in youth, by a pious mother, to the service of the Lord, educated by the Culdees of Ireland, he began his activity in the year 690 A. D., in Frisia. But driven thence he went to Denmark, where he purchased thirty boys and educated them as Christians—one of these, according to tradition, is said to have been Sigwald, son of the Danish king, afterwards St. Sebaldees, whom Nuremberg honors as its Apostle. About the year 700 A. D., Willebrard visited a certain king Yugrim (Ongendus), at whose court a congregation seems to have organized. One hundred years thereafter, the Frisian Bishop, Ijudger, determined to enter Denmark, but was not permitted.

In reality, a Danish mission was first established in consequence of certain political relations that existed between the Danish and the German Imperial Courts. At the latter court wishes to the above effect had already been entertained

at an early date. In a letter of Alcuin (730 A. D.) to a worthy clergyman in Saxony,* there is asked the question: whether there be any hope ever to see the Danes converted. Charlemagne seems to have done nothing further in this direction, than to have established a chapel for the garrison at Essehæ (Itzehæ), about the year 809 A. D., and to have created the distinguished priest, Heridaack, at Hamburg.

Under his successor, Ludwig the Pious, the contentions concerning the hereditary succession in Denmark, and the appeal for assistance coming from Harald (a Prince of Jutland) of the House of Halfdan, gave the Emperor occasion to send an embassy to him. For this purpose he selected the Archbishop of Ebo of Rheims, a man aglow with missionary zeal as well as experienced in business affairs. Endowed with plenary powers from Pope Paschalis I., he crossed the Eider in the year 823 A. D.—Accompanied for a time by Bishop Haltigar of Cambray, he baptized a number of Danes and took home with him several boys, whom he educated as teachers for their own people. Welanao, (the present village of Münster), not far from Essehæ, served as his base of operations; here he erected a cloister. He retained a life-long interest in the Danish mission, although, becoming involved in the internal dissensions of France he could not personally, continue in the work begun by himself.

When, in the year 826 A. D., the Emperor held an Imperial Diet, at Ingelenheim, (the present Lower-Ingelheim), not far from Mayence, King Harald, with his wife, son, and a large retinue of followers, attended the same. In St. Alban's Minster, south of golden Mayence, the king with his attendants, amidst great solemnity, was received into the bosom of the church. Now, however, it became a matter of importance, to procure servants of Christ, who should be adapted to the work of accompanying these Danes, hardly fixed in the faith, to their distant homes, and to establish among their people the dominion of the Cross. For this purpose *Ansgar* was chosen.

* Vide Jaffé, Monumenta Alcuiniana, p. 165, epist. 13.

Ansgar, the son of Frankish parents, was born about the year 800 A. D.—the date usually accepted being Sept. 9th, 801 A. D.—not far from the cloister Corvey, belonging to the diocese of Amiens. Under the influence of an excellent mother, whom, however, he had the misfortune to lose at the age of five, his mind was inclined in early youth to quiet, religious meditation and prayer, not without a tendency to visionary piety, which in those days often showed itself united with clearness of understanding and practical thoroughness. His inner life began to be outwardly reflected in visions, regarded by him as divinely sent. He beheld in a vision the Holy Virgin, who commanded him to flee the vanity of the world, in order that he might become worthy to meet his departed mother in heaven. Soon thereafter he entered the above named cloister, which, being transformed into a Benedictine Abbey, became the seat of earnest piety, and, according to the standard of that age, of thorough scientific education, where men like Paschasius Radbertus prepared the youth for the service of Church and State. The abbot Adalhard, a relative of Charlemagne, associated with his brother Wala in the government of the cloister, had special charge of Ansgar's training.

The news of the Emperor's death, whom the boy Ansgar had once seen in power and glory, deeply impressed him with the emptiness of all earthly things. After this he had various visions, now warning and then frightening him, at times exalted by the pardoning assurance of the Redeemer, or by a vision of the brightness and glory of heaven.*

It was about this time that he conceived the hope, retained unto old age, of gaining the crown of martyrdom.

In the year 822 A. D., a colony from Corbie was sent out to found the German cloister of Corvey, in Westphalia, for the purpose of exerting a Christian influence upon the Saxon population. In company with other monks, Ansgar was ordered thither in 823 A. D., when he was appointed not only to the position of Scholasticus, (*i. e.* Rector of the school)

*Vide Rimberty Vita Ansg. cap. II.

but also as preacher to the people in the convent church, because of his eloquence. Already at that time, did he reveal the wonderful gift of attracting others and of influencing them in a soothing manner.

It was in the year 826 A. D., that King Harald desired to take with him to his home a missionary. Ansgar, to whom was offered this difficult and dangerous mission, accepted it with joy, in spite of all dissuasions. Among his most trusted friends was the excellent friar Autbert, likewise of a distinguished, highly respected family, at the court of the Frankish kings. The latter declared that his heart would not permit him to let the beloved brother depart alone; he would go with him as his faithful companion. Thus, in a fraternal manner, they entered upon their journey, descending the Rhine. In the beginning, they were much annoyed by the uncivil behavior of the king; but their mildness conquered him. Passing Cologne and Dørstade, they entered, as it is supposed, the mouth of the Weser, in whose vicinity lay the dukedom of Rinstri (Ruestringen), which the Emperor Ludwig had bestowed upon King Harald in fee, to serve the latter, in case of necessity, as a place of refuge.* They tarried for some time on the then Saxon-Danish border, in the commercial town of Sliaswich (Schleswig) according to the German, Haddelbye (Heithaby) according to the Old-Norse appellation. This appears to have been the central point of their missionary activity, beginning with the year 827 A. D. Here they purchased and instructed Danish children, ransomed prisoners of war, rendered assistance to the poor, and preached round about in the country. They educated twelve native boys for the ministerial office, and also gained accessions to their ranks from Germany. Ansgar's personality won every one with whom he came in contact. Notwithstanding many warlike feuds, through which their settlement was often threatened, they succeeded in making numerous conversions. But soon Harald was compelled to flee the country, and to seek the above-mentioned place of

*Vide Pertz, Monum. Vol. II., p. 466 sqq.

refuge.* It was now impossible for these Christian teachers to continue their activity at that point, and accordingly Ansgar and Autbert followed the king. After co-operating for at least two years with his great friend, the latter was obliged to return to Corvey, on account of physical infirmity, where he died soon thereafter, in the year 829 A. D. King Harald, in later years, as partisan of the Emperor Lothaire, relapsed into heathenism.

After Autbert's death, there came to the Emperor Ludwig, from the Swedish King Björn, ambassadors, who announced, that, not only through traders, but also through prisoners, the desire for the Gospel had been awakened among his people, and the wish expressed that missionaries might be sent to them. The result was that Ansgar, accompanied by Witmar, his former associate at the convent school, was ordered from Corvey to Sweden. On their voyage they were attacked and plundered by Vikings. Nothing daunted, they arrived at last, safe and sound, after a trying and tedious journey, at the city of Bjærkø, on Lake Mælar,—situated upon an island, sometimes identified with Birka, incorrectly with Sigtuna. Here the king received the empty-handed missionaries in a friendly manner. The chieftain of that region, the king's confidential councilor, Hergejr (Heriger), built for them a chapel upon his own land, shortly after the successful beginning of their mission. He, and others that were baptized with him, remained faithful to Ansgar and to the Christian religion from that time forward. Ansgar spent two winters in Sweden. In the year 831 A. D., he returned home, in order to report to the Emperor concerning the success of the mission.

About this time there was carried out a plan, important for the success of the Norse mission, whose conception is attributed to Charlemagne, and for whose execution his son Ludwig had now found the right man. This was the establishing of a bishopric in Hamburg. Before the return of Ansgar, the imperial diet at Aix-la-Chapelle, 831 A. D., had

* Vide Pertz Monum. Vol. I., p. 638.

determined upon the matter. It was intended that this new bishopric should include Northalbingia, *i. e.* Stormarm, Holstein and Ditmarsh. The brother of the Emperor, bishop Drogo, of Metz, assisted by three Arch-bishops: Ebo, of Rheims, Hetti, of Treves, and Otgar, of Mayence, consecrated the new bishop. Without doubt the reason of this unusually solemn consecration lay in the thought, that the bishop of Hamburg was destined to assume arch-episcopal functions, and that Hamburg would become the ecclesiastical metropolis for the whole of Scandinavia. A bull of Gregory IV.* confirmed the imperial arrangement. It is said that Ansgar received the pallium in Rome, from the hands of the pope himself. A few years thereafter, in May, 834 A. D., the Emperor Ludwig bestowed upon the new bishopric the rich cloister of Thorout (Turholt) in West Flanders, south of Bruges, to serve as a certain source of revenue, and at the same time as a place of refuge in times of danger. Somewhat later, the pope appointed a near relative of Ebo's, named Gauzbert (called Gautbert in the Northland), as leader of the Norse Mission, and bestowed upon him Welanao or Welnau, at present the village of Münster, near Itzehoe, as his special base of operations. He built a church at Bjærkæ, and appears to have discharged the duties of his office in peace for several years. In the meanwhile a hostile heathen party was forming, and at last the storm broke out in fury. During the persecution that ensued, one of Gauzbert's assistant priests was killed. He himself was forced to give up the Swedish mission, and was afterwards made Bishop of Osnabrück.

About this time (845 A. D.), Hamburg, the point of departure and seat of the Danish mission, also received a severe blow. Heathen hordes filling six hundred vessels, approached the city by the way of the Elbe, commanded by Haarichæ I. (Harichs), king of the Danish west-kingdom, who fell upon that military depot and mission-station, intending thereby to

*Vide Mabillon, *Acta Sanct. Bened. Ord. IV.*, II., p. 124.

avenge the victory, which Ludwig the German had won over the neighboring Wends. The city, with its surroundings, was terribly plundered and then destroyed. The Church built by Ansgar, his cloister, library, and a copy of the Holy Scriptures presented to him by Ludwig the Pious, became a prey to the flames. Seeking refuge with his neighbor, bishop Leuderich of Bremen, he was repulsed by him in a shameful manner. Even the revenues of Thorout were lost, since Charles the Bald had bestowed that cloister upon one of his feudal lords. Ansgar, poor and helpless, fleeing from place to place, saving nothing but his precious relics of the saints, was now deserted by many of his associate laborers. But he was silent and endured.

Ludwig, the German, endeavored first of all to regain for him possession of Thorout. Failing in this he appointed Ansgar to the vacant bishopric of Bremen. The see of Hamburg was abolished and its jurisdiction divided between Verden and Bremen. Ansgar had serious misgivings in thus passing from one church to another, which however were quieted by a vision granted to him. In a bull of May 31st, 864 A. D., Pope Nicholas I. ordered that the dioceses of Hamburg and Bremen should be one, acknowledging the arch-episcopal rank of the former, and restoring to the diocese of Verden that part which had been taken away from it and connected with Hamburg.

Upon this declaration rested the arch-episcopal rank and station which Ansgar himself, as well as his followers, assumed. But whilst this new order of things was thus being established, Ansgar continued to labor with great fidelity upon the chief aim of his life. As soon as he had located himself in Bremen, the mission cause felt a new impetus. He now appears as prince of the Church, and, as the custom of the country demanded, recommended himself to the court and its nobles by presents; but especially by his mild and venerable personality did he gain such an influence upon King Haarick that he received permission to build a church in Haddebye on the Schlei. This first Danish cathedral, like the mother-church in Hamburg, was dedicated to "Our

Ladies" (women). From that time onward, Christianity was publicly recognized as an established religion alongside of the old popular faith, and the Church could progress in peace. After Haarik's death there came again a time of persecution and great distress, which, however, did not continue very long. For the successor, King Haarik the Younger, soon took a friendly position over against Christianity, and openly testified: "That he had never seen so good a man as Ansgar." He permitted the church at Haddebye to receive a chime of bells so timidly feared by the heathen. Besides this, a plot of ground was set apart in the city of Ribe for the building of a large church.

With all this Ansgar, however, did not forget the Christian congregation in Sweden, which Gauzbert was obliged to forsake. He sent, first of all, to Bjærkø, a hermit priest named Ardgar. Then he went there himself in company with Erimbert, a relative of Gauzbert's (848—850 A. D.) The moment of his arrival was a critical one, and the condition of things difficult to manage. It was said that the gods were angry because their worship had been neglected. But a short time before this the national council, presided over by King Olof, had elevated a deceased king to the rank of a god. In short a heathen reaction made itself felt. Thereupon the king submitted the question to the popular assembly whether they would suffer Christ to be preached. In reply an aged sire arose and cited examples of the power of the Christian's God. It was therefore determined that the preaching of the Gospel might be continued, and that nothing should hinder the administration of the sacraments. Erimbert, as head of the mission, remained with several assistants in Sweden, whilst Ansgar, on account of other official duties was obliged to depart.

Having arrived at home, Ansgar manifested in various ways, until the end of life, the true priestly spirit which inspired him. In Bremen he founded an asylum for the sick and for the stranger. To the poor he gave rich gifts, and washed their feet. He ransomed prisoners and educated boys to become missionaries. He retained a special love for

monastic and hermit life. He visited the pious Luizbirga, in the valley of the Bode (Harz mountains), and committed young maidens to her care, to be trained in singing spiritual songs, in domestic acquirements and artistic accomplishments. He himself loved to knit nets amidst prayer and meditation. He made it a duty for the missionaries to imitate his own unselfishness, in not accepting any gifts from the converts, and in supporting themselves with the labor of their own hands. He regarded Martin of Tours, who had been transformed from a heathen warrior into a tender-hearted bishop as his. He wore continually a coarse hair-cloth shirt, fasted rigorously, prayed and sang a great deal. Those who would have glorified him as a worker of miracles, he rebuked with the words: "The greatest wonder it will be if God would yet make of me a truly pious man." When the temptation came upon him to consider himself above all others among the elect, he was very deeply humbled by a vision. So, too, it required a vision to pacify him that he was not to die the death of a martyr. Before the end of his life, in a short letter that has been preserved, he affectionately and earnestly commended to the German bishops and to Ludwig the German, the interests of the Norse mission, and his own bishopric as the central point of the same. Amidst exhortations to Rimbert of Flanders, the dearest of his scholars, and to others, amidst the songs and prayers of his friends, strengthened by choice passages of the Holy Scriptures, Ansgar died in peace, Feb. 3d, 865 A. D., in Bremen, where he was buried on the following day. Pope Nicholas I. canonized him not long thereafter. Rimbert, priest at Ribe, became his successor. What Ebo of Rheims had predicted in troublous times was fulfilled, and has continued to fulfil itself more and more gloriously: "That the work begun by them to the honor of the name of Christ, should not pass away, but flourish and bear fruit, until the name of the Lord should penetrate unto the borders of the earth." In memory of Ansgar, the 3d. of February (and in some parts also the 4th of February) was celebrated in an especial manner by the churches of the Northland. In the year 1826, as well as in 1834, Scandinavia com-

memorated the millennial jubilee of the introduction of Christianity.

A collection of short prayers, written by Ansgar, and connected with the Psalms of David, under the title of "Pigmenta," (Balsam), has been preserved; also a life of Willehad, first bishop of Bremen,* which affords evidence that Ansgar was in all respects fully possessed of the learning of his times.

ARTICLE III.

"ASCENSIO ISALÆ."

Translated from the critical edition of the Ethiopic text of Prof. Dillmann, by Rev. GEO. H. SCHODDE, A. M., Ph. D., Martin's Ferry, Ohio.

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

1. The earliest testimony of an apocryphal work attributed to Isaiah, is found in the *Dialogus cum Typhone* of Justin Martyr, who speaks c. 120, of Isaiah, ὃν πρίονι ἐβλίνφ ἐπίσασατε. The quotation is not, indeed, a direct one, but its peculiar wording points to the first part of the *Ascensio* as its source, as the Jewish traditions concerning the death of Isaiah do not say that he was sawn asunder by a wooden saw, but, that, when Isaiah was pressed by his enemies, a cedar- (or a carob-) tree "opened and swallowed him," and that this tree was sawn through, and Isaiah perished in this manner. Soon after, Tertullian, in his *de Patientia*, c. 14, makes the remark: "His patientiæ viribus secatur Esaias et de Domino non tacet," evidently referring to chap. 5, v. 14 of the *Ascensio*. Then in the Apostolic Constitutions is mentioned an ἀπόκρυφον Ἡσαίου. The existence of this work is made certain by the two citations by Origen, *Comm. in Matth.* 13 : 57, and *Epist. ad African.*, c. 9, where it is both times quoted as ἀπόκρυφον Ἡσαίου. The same writer, in his homily on Is. 1, without mentioning the source, quotes chap. 3 : 8, 9 of the *Ascensio*. Epiphanius, when speaking of the ἀρχοντικοί,

* Pertz Monumenta, II.

says their heresy was partly taken from the ἀναβατικὸν Ἰσαίου, and quotes from it chap. 9 : 27, 32—36 ; chap. 11 : 32, 33, again as the ἀναβατικὸν Ἰσαίου. Again, chap. 5 : 4, 8, is virtually quoted by Ambrose, in his commentary on Ps. 118. In an imperfect commentary upon Matthew, inserted among the works of Chrysostom, are found almost the very words of chap. 1 : 1, 2, 4, 7, 12, 13. Here, too, the name Manasseh is explained, by deriving it from נִשְׁכַּח, *oblivisci*. Much later, in the catalogue of Euthymius Zigabenus, mention is made of the ὁράσεις Ἰσαίου, evidently referring to the second part of the *Ascensio*, chap. 6 seq., while the διαθήκη Ἠζεχίου of Georgius Cedrenus refers to the first part.

This important apocryphal seemed to have been lost, until Richard Laurence, Regius Professor of Hebrew in Oxford, discovered an Ethiopic copy of it in the Bodleiana, and published it, with a Latin and an English translation, in 1819. Text and translation, considering that he had but one MS., and only Ludolf to guide him in his Ethiopic studies, are good, although containing some disastrous mistakes. This remained the only edition of the text till the master-hand of Prof. Dillmann undertook to issue a thoroughly revised edition. Having now *three* MSS. to consult, and a thorough mastery of Ethiopic, the *Altmeister* sent forth, in 1877, a critical text with a Latin translation, and, as appendices, added the fragments of the Latin translations extant, together with critical and exegetical notes. This edition partly owes its existence to the festival of the fourth centennial of Dillmann's Alma Mater, Tuebingen.

The Ethiopic translation itself is good, and, like Henoch, and other works of similar kind, copies the tone and manner of the Ethiopic version of the Bible. It is from the Greek.

2. That the *Ascensio* was originally *two* distinct works is apparent at first glance. The real *Ascensio* begins with chap. 6, and continues to the end, and, without any doubt whatever, is a *vaticinium post eventum*. Its Christian authorship is certain. Of the first part we can, with the same certainty, say that it sprung from a Jewish source. Dillmann analyses the books as follows : 1) Chap. 2 : 1 to chap. 3 : 12 and 5 : 2—

14, are Jewish, not showing the least trace of Christian influence; 2) chap. 6 : 1, chap. 11 : 1, 23—40, the proper *Ascensio*, is the work of a Christian. That this once circulated as a separate book is probable from the fact that the old Latin translation, published by Angelus Maius, contains this part only. 3) These two parts were united by a Christian editor, who added chap. 1, (except 1, 3, 4a), chap. 11, 42, 43. 4) This was again revised by another Christian hand, which added chap. 3 : 13 to chap. 5 : 1, and chap. 11 : 2—22, together with chap. 1 : 3, 4a, chap. 5 : 15, 16, chap. 11 : 41. That the *whole* work, as such, was also extant in the western Church, is seen from the second Latin translation, found by Gieseler, where different parts of the whole work are quoted. Internal evidences point to the end of the second century after Christ as the date of this work. For further explanations consult the editions and notes of Laurence and Dillmann, especially the latter.

[II. TRANSLATION.]

THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH, THE PROPHET.

1 And it came to pass in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, king of Judah, that he called Manasseh, his son, for he was his only (son); 2 and called him into the presence of Isaiah, the son of Amos, the prophet, and into the presence Iosab, the son of Isaiah, that he might deliver to him the words of the truth (righteousness), which the king himself had seen; 3 and of the eternal judgments, and of the torments of Gehenna, which is the place of eternal punishments, and of its angels and its dominions and its powers; 4 and of the words of the faith of the Beloved-one, which he had seen in the fifteenth year of his reign in his sickness. 5 And he delivered to him the written words, which Sammas the scribe had written, and those which Isaiah, the son of Amos, had given to him and to the prophets to transcribe and deposit them with him, that which he had seen in the house of the king concerning the judgment of the angels, and the destruction of this world, and the garments of the saints, and their de-

parture and concerning their transformation, and the persecution and the ascension of the Beloved-one. 6 In the twentieth year of the reign of Hezekiah, Isaiah saw the words of this prophecy and delivered them to his son Iosab. And he (*i. e.* Hezekiah) took it, in the presence of Iosab, the son of Isaiah, 7 and Isaiah said to king Hezekiah, not in the presence of Manasseh alone: "As God liveth, whose name has not been transmitted to this world, and as liveth the Beloved-one of my Lord, and as liveth the Spirit, who speaks through me, all these commands and these words will become void in the presence of Manasseh, thy son, and by the work of his hands I shall go tormented in my body. 8 And Sammael Malkira will serve Manasseh, and fulfill his every wish, and he will be a follower of Berial rather than of me, 9 and will turn many in Jerusalem and in Judah from the faith of truth (righteousness), and Belial will dwell over him and by his hands I shall be sawn asunder. 10 And Hezekiah hearing this word, wept exceedingly, and rent his garments and threw dust upon his head and fell upon his face. 11 And Isaiah said to him: "The plan of Sammael concerning Manasseh is consummated; words profit thee nothing herein." 12 And Hezekiah thought in his heart to kill Manasseh, his son. 13 And Isaiah said to Hezekiah: "The Beloved-one has frustrated thy plan, nor will the thoughts of thy heart be fulfilled; for I am called away by this calling, and will become heir to the inheritance of the Beloved-one."

II. 1 And it came to pass, after Hezekiah had died and Manasseh was ruling, that he did not remember the commands of Hezekiah, his father, but forgot them, and Sammael dwelt over Manasseh and adhered to him. 2 And Manasseh ceased to serve the God of his father, but served Satan and his angels and his powers, 3 and changed in the house of his father those things which were before the face of Hezekiah, the words of wisdom and the service of God. 4 And Manasseh changed his heart to serve Belial; for the angel of iniquity ruling this world is Belial, whose name is Matanbukus, and he rejoiced in Jerusalem on account of Manasseh, and firmly held him in the seduction and iniquity, which was

disseminated in Jerusalem. 5 And magic, and incantation, and augury, and divination, and adultery, and persecution of saints, increased through Manasseh, and through Belkirah, and through Tobia, the Canaanite, and through John of Anathoth, and through Zalig-Newai. 6 And the rest of the words, behold, are written in the book of the kings of Judah and of Israel. 7 And Isaiah, the son of Amos, when he saw the great iniquity which was committed in Jerusalem, and the service of Satan, and the wanton conversation there, he withdrew from Jerusalem and dwelt in Bethlehem of Judea. 8 But there also there was great iniquity. And after he had withdrawn from Bethlehem, he dwelt on a mountain in a deserted place. 9 And Micah, the prophet, and Ananias, the aged, and Joel and Habbakuk, and Josab, his son, and many who believed in the ascension to heaven, the faithful, withdrew and dwelt on the mountain. 10 All were clothed in sackcloth, and all were prophets, and had nothing with them, but were naked, and all lamented exceedingly over the desertion of Israel. 11 And they ate nothing except the wild herbs which they pulled of the mountain, and cooking these, they ate together with the prophet Isaiah; and they lived on the mountains and on the hills, two years. 12 And after this, while they were in the desert, there was also a man in Samaria, whose name was Balkira, of the kindred of Saducia, the son of Chanaan, a false prophet, whose home was in Bethlehem. And Ezechias, the son of Chanaan, who was the brother of that one's father, in the days of Ahab, king of Israel, was the teacher of four hundred prophets of Baal, and smote upon the cheek and reproved Michia the prophet, the son of Amiodod. 13 But he was reproved by Ahab, and Michia was cast into prison with Sadocia, the prophet, and were with Ochozia, the son of Almerem Balaav. 14 And Elijah, the Tishbite, of Gilead, reproached Ochozia and Samaria, and he prophesied concerning Ochozia, that he would die in his bed by sickness, and that Samaria would be given into the hand of Lebonasser (*i. e.* Salmanasser), because it had slain the prophets of God. 15 And when the false prophets who were with Ocho-

zia, the son of Ahab, and their teacher, Jalerias, from Mt. Joel, 16 and when Ibkira, the brother of Sadocia, heard this, they persuaded Ochozia, the king, (to trust) Aguanon and - - - Michia.

III. 1 And Balkirà perceived and saw the place of Isaiah and the prophets who were with him; for he dwelt in Bethlehem and was attached to Manasseh; and he prophesied false words in Jerusalem, and many of Jerusalem were associated with him, but *he* was of Samaria. 2 And it came to pass when Alagarzagar (Salmanassar), king of Assyria, came and took captive Samaria, and led nine parts of the people into captivity, and sent them into the provinces of the Medes and to the rivers of Tazon (Gozan), 3 but he being young escaped and came to Jerusalem, in the days of Hezekiah, the king of Judah, and did not walk in the ways of his father of Samaria, for he feared Hezekiah. 4 And he was found in the days of Hezekiah speaking words of iniquity in Jerusalem, 5 and the children of Hezekiah accused him, but he escaped to the country of Bethlehem, and gained a reputation. 6 And Balkira accused Isaiah, the prophet, and the prophets who were with him, saying: "Isaiah and they who are with him, prophesy against Jerusalem and against the cities of Judah: 'that they will be destroyed,' and Benjamin: 'that it will go into captivity,' and against thee, Oh Lord king: 'that in fetters and in iron chains thou wilt walk,' 7 and they prophesy falsehoods in Israel and Judah. 8 And Isaiah himself said: 'I see more than Moses the prophet;' 9 but Moses has said: 'No man can see God, and live,' and Isaiah says: 'I have seen God, and behold, I live.' 10 Oh, king, believe that these are false prophets!" He also calls Jerusalem, Sodom, and the princes of Judah and of Jerusalem, he declares the people of Gomorrha." And in many things he accused Isaiah and the prophets before Manasseh. 11 And Berial dwelt in the heart of Manasseh, and in the heart of the princes of Judah and of Benjamin, and of the eunuchs and of the counsellors of the king. And the word of Balkira pleased him exceedingly. 12 And he sent and seized Isaiah. 13 For Berial

was in a great rage concerning Isaiah, on account of the vision and the revelation, which revealed Sammael, and because through him was seen the coming of the Beloved-one from the seventh heaven, and His transformation and His descend, and the form by which He was to be transformed into the form of a man, the persecution He was to suffer, and the torments, which the children of Israel would inflict on Him, the coming of His twelve disciples, and the instruction, and that He would be suspended on a tree before the Sabbath, and would be suspended with men, the perpetrators of iniquity, and that he would be buried in a grave, 14, and the twelve who are with him, will be offended at Him, and there will be guards guarding the grave, 15 and the descent of the angel of the Christian Church which is in heaven, who in the last days will call, and the angel, the Holy Ghost, 16 and Michael, the angel of the holy angels, and that on the third day His grave would be opened, 17 and the Beloved-one himself sitting on the shoulders of the seraphim, will go out, and will send out His twelve disciples, 18 and they will teach all nations and all tongues concerning the resurrection of the Beloved-one, and they who believe in His cross will be saved, and His assumption into the seventh heaven, from whence he will come, 19 and that many, who believe in Him will speak by the Holy Ghost, 20 and many signs and wonders will take place in those days, 21 and afterwards concerning His (second) coming, the disciples will forsake the doctrine of the twelve apostles, and their faith and charity and holiness, 22 and there will be much contention concerning His coming and approach. 23 And on that day there will be many who love office, although destitute of wisdom, 24 and there will be many wicked elders, and shepherds oppressing their sheep and then will be rapacious, even the holy shepherds. 25 And many will exchange the beautiful garments of the saints for the garment of the lover of gold, and there will be much respect of persons in those days, and lovers of the honor of this world, 26 and there will be calumny and many calumniators, and naked honor at the approach of the Lord, and the Holy Spirit will depart

from many. 27 And there will not be many prophets in those days, nor they who speak fixed (truths) except one here and there, 28 on account of the spirit of falsehood, and of fornication, and of naked honor, and of the love of gold, which will be in those who are called the servants thereof, (*i. e.* of gold) and of those who possess it. 29 And there will be in their midst great enmity, among the shepherds and elders, and between them. 30 For there will be much envy in these last days, for each one will speak of that which in his eyes causes desire, 31 and they will disregard the prophecy of the prophets who were before me, and they will disregard my visions that they may speak the ebullitions of their own heart."

IV. 1 "This, then, oh Hezekiah and Josab, my son, these are the days the world calls (?). 2 And after this is consummated, will descend Berial, the great angel, the king of this world who rules it since it stands, and will descend from the firmament in the form of a man, as king of iniquity, a matricide; he is the king of this world, 3 and the plant the twelve Apostles have planted he will pluck out; from the twelve it will be given into his hands. 4 This angel Berial, in the form of this king, will come, and there will come with him all the powers of this world, and they will hear (obey) him in everything he desires. 5 And at his word, the sun will rise at night, and he will cause the moon to appear in the sixth hour, 6 and everything that he wishes, he will do in the world; he will act and speak in the presence of the Beloved-one and will say: 'I am god, and before me there was none.' 7 And all men in the world will believe in him, 8 and will sacrifice to him, and will serve him, saying: 'He is god and beside him there is no other.' 9 And a multitude of those who have joined to receive the Beloved-one, will turn after him.' 10 And the power of his prodigies will be in every city and country, 11 and he will establish his image before him in every city, 12 and he will govern three years and six months and twenty-seven days. 13 And many believers and saints, when they see Him, for whom they hoped, but who was crucified, Jesus,

the Lord Christ, after I, Isaiah, have seen Him, who was suspended and ascended, and who believe in Him—a few from amongst them in those days will be left, His servants, fleeing from desert to desert expecting His coming. 14 But after one thousand three hundred and thirty-two days, the Lord will come with His angels, and with the hosts of the saints from the seventh heaven with the glory of the seventh heaven, and will put Berial into gehenna together with his hosts, 15 and will give rest to those whom He has found in the body in this world, to the pious; but the sun shall be ashamed, 16 and to all who, on account of the faith have execrated Berial and his kings. But the saints will walk with the Lord in His raiments, which are deposited above in the seventh heaven; and with the Lord will come whose spirits are clothed, they will descend and live in the world, and He will strengthen those, who with the saints are found in the flesh with the garments of the saints, and will minister to those who have watched in this world. 17 And after that they will be changed in their clothing of above, and their bodies will be left in the world. 18 Then the voice of the Beloved will rebuke in rage this heaven and this dry (land), and the mountains, and the hills, and the cities, and the desert, and the trees, and the angel of the sun, and the moon, and everything in which Berial has been seen, and manifested himself in this world, and there will be a resurrection and a judgment in those days in their midst, and the Beloved-one will cause fire to ascend from Himself, and it will consume all the impious, and they will be as if they had not been created. 19 But the remainder of the words of the vision are written in the vision of Babylon. 20 And the rest of the vision of the Lord, behold is written parabolically in my words written in the book which I have publicly prophesied, 21 also the descent of the Beloved-one into hell, behold, is written in the section in which the Lord says: ‘Behold, my son will understand,’ and all this, behold, is written in the Psalms; in the Proverbs of David, the son of Jesse, and in the Proverbs of Solomon, his son, and in the words of Kore, and Ethan, the Israelite, and in the words of Asaph, and in the rest of the

Psalms, which the angel of the spirit has dictated, 22 in those whose name is not written, and in the words of Amos, my father, and of Hosen, the prophet, and of Micah, and of Joel, and of Nahum, and of Jonah, and of Obadiah, and of Habbakuk and of Haggai, and of Sephaniah, and of Zechariah and of Malachi, and in the words of Joseph, the Just, and in the words of Daniel."

V. 1 On account of these visions, Berial was enraged at Isaiah, and dwelt in the heart of Manasseh, and sawed Isaiah asunder with a wooden saw. 2 And while Isaiah was being sawed asunder, Balkira stood accusing him, and the prophets of falsehood all stood laughing and rejoicing over Isaiah. 3 And Balkira and Mekernbekus stood before Isaiah laughing sarcastically, 4 and Beliar said to Isaiah: "Say I have lied in every thing I have said, and that the ways of Manasseh, are good and just, 5 and that the ways of Balkira are good and also of those who are with him." 6 This he said to him when they began to saw him asunder. 7 And Isaiah was in a vision of the Lord, and his eyes were open, and he saw them. 8 And Milkira said this to Isaiah: "say that which I shall say to thee, and I will turn their hearts and will compel Manasseh and the princes of Judah and the people and all Jerusalem to worship thee." 9 But Isaiah answered and said: "If it depended on me, by my word, thou wouldst be accursed, and thy hosts and all thy house, 10 for thou canst verily take nothing but the skin of my body." 11 And they seized and sawed asunder Isaiah, the son of Amos, with a wooden saw. 12 And Manasseh and Balkira and the prophets of falsehood, and the princes and the people and all stood looking. 13 But to the prophets who were with him he said before he was sawed asunder: "Go to the country of Tyre and Sidon, for me alone the Lord has mixed the cup." 14 But Isaiah, while he was being sawn, did not cry nor weep, but his mouth spoke with the Holy Spirit until he was cut into two pieces. 15 This did Berial to Isaiah through Balkira and Manasseh, for Sammael was in great anger against Isaiah from the days of Hezekiah, the king of the Jews, on account of the words he had seen

concerning the Beloved-one, 16 and concerning the destruction of Sammael, which he saw through god, while Hezekiah his father, was yet ruling. But he did it according to the will of Satan.

THE VISION WHICH ISAIAH THE SON OF AMOS SAW IN THE TWENTIETH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HEZEKIAH, KING OF JUDAH.

VI. 1 Isaiah, the son of Amos, and Josab, the son of Isaiah, came to Hezekiah, to Jerusalem from Gilgal, 2 and he (*i. e.* Isaiah) sat down on the bed of the king; and they brought to him a throne, but he refused to sit upon it. 3 And then Isaiah commenced to speak to Hezekiah the king, concerning the faith and truth (righteousness), and all the princes of Israel, and the eunuchs, and the counselors of the king sat down. And there were forty prophets, and sons of prophets; they had come from the outskirts and from the hills and from the fields, when they heard that Isaiah had come from Gilgal to Hezekiah, 4 and they came to salute him and to hear his words, 5 and that he might put his hand over them, so that they too could prophesy, and he could hear their prophecy; and all were in the presence of Isaiah. 6 And when Isaiah spoke with Hezekiah the words of truth (righteousness) and of faith, they all heard the portal which was opened, and also the voice of the Spirit. 7 And the king called all the prophets, and all the people who were found there, and they came, but Micah and Ananias, the aged, and Joel and Josab to his right. 8 And it came to pass, when they all heard the voice of the Holy Spirit, they all worshipped on their knees, and glorified the God of truth, the Most High, Him, who is in the world above, and who dwells above, the Holy One who rests among the saints, 9 and gave glory to Him who has graciously granted an entrance to the other world, had graciously granted it to men. 10 And while speaking with the Holy Ghost, and all were listening, he became silent, and his mind was elevated above him, and he did not see the men who stood before him; 11 and his eyes were open but his mouth was silent, and his mortal mind was elevated above him, 12 but his breathing

continued in him, for he saw a vision. 13 And the angel who was sent to cause him to see (this vision) was not of this firmament, nor was he of the angels of the glory of this world, but he came from the seventh heaven. 14 But the people who stood by, except the circle of the prophets, thought that the holy Isaiah had been taken away. 15 And the vision which he saw was not of this world, but of a world concealed from the flesh. 16 And Isaiah, after he had seen this vision, told it to Hezekiah and to Josab, his son, and to the other prophets who had come. 17 But the judges and the eunuchs and the people did not hear it, except Samna, the scribe, and Ijoagem and Asaph, the scribe of the chronicles, for these two were doers of justice, and the odor of the Spirit was within them; but the people did not hear, for Micah and Josab, his son, had caused them to depart when the wisdom of this world was taken from him, as from one dead.

VII. 1 The vision, then, which Isaiah saw, he told to Hezekiah, and to Josab, his son, and to Micah, and to the other prophets, 2 and it was this: "As I prophesied as ye have heard, I saw a glorious angel, whose glory was not like that of the angels which I always see, but great was the glory and the office, so that I cannot relate the glory of this angel. 3 I saw him as he took my hand, and I said to him: 'Who art thou? And what is thy name? And whither wilt thou cause me to ascend?' For the power of conversing with him was given to me. 4 And he said to me: 'When I have caused thee to ascend the ascent, and shown thee the vision, on account of which I have been sent, then thou wilt understand who I am; but my name thou wilt not know, 5 because thou must return to thy flesh, but whither I shall cause thee to ascend thou shalt see, for to this purpose have I been sent.' 6 And I rejoiced, for he conversed mildly with me. 7 And he said to me: 'Dost those rejoice because I speak mildly with thee?' And he said: 'And Him, who magnified me, thou shalt see speaking mildly and calmly with thee; 8 and the Father of Him, who has magnified me, thou wilt see; for to this purpose was I sent from the seventh heaven, that

I should enlighten thee in all this." 9 And we ascended into the firmament, I and he, and there I saw Sammael and his hosts, and there was great slaughter therein, and words of Satan, and each one contended with the other. 10 And as it is above, it is on the earth, because a similitude of what is in the firmament is also here on the earth. 11 And I said to the angel: 'What is the contention?' 12 And he said to me: 'Thus it hath been since this world exists until now, and this slaughter (will continue) till He comes, whom you will see, and He will put an end to it.' 13 And afterwards he caused me to ascend above the firmament; for that is a heaven. 14 And there I saw a throne in the midst, and to the right and to the left thereof there were angels; 15 nor was any one like the angels who stood to the right, but they who stood to the right were exceedingly splendid, and they all glorified with *one* voice, and the throne was in the midst, and it they glorified; then also they who were to the left, after them; but their voice was not like the voice of those who were on the right, nor was their glory like the glory of those. 16 And I asked the angel who was conducting me, and said to him: 'To whom is the glorifying addressed?' 17 And he said to me: 'The glory of the seventh heaven to Him who rests in the holy world, and to His Beloved-one, from whom I am sent to thee, thither it is addressed.' 18 And again he caused me to ascend into the second heaven; but the height of this heaven was the same as from the earth to heaven and to the firmament. 19 And there, as in the first heaven, were angels to the right and left, and a throne in the midst, and the glory of angels, which was in the first heaven; and He who sat on the throne in the second heaven had greater glory than all. 20 And great glory was in the second heaven, and their glory was not like the glory of those who were in the first heaven. 21 And I fell on my face to worship him, but the angel who conducted me, did not permit me, but said to me: 'Worship not, neither the angel nor the throne of him who is of the sixth heaven, whence I am sent, before I shall have told thee in the seventh heaven.

22 For above all the heavens and their angels, thy throne and thy garments and thy crown, which thou wilt see, have been placed.' 23 And I rejoiced exceedingly, because they who loved the Most High and His Beloved-one will, at last, ascend thither through the angel of the Holy Ghost. 24 And he caused me to ascend into the third heaven, and there in like manner, I saw those to the right and to the left, and there was a throne in the midst, and he who sat thereon, but a remembrance of this world was not made there. 25 And I said to the angel who was with me, for the glory of my face was changing as I ascended to each heaven: 'There is nothing of that vain world commemorated here.' 26 And he answered me saying: 'No one commemorates it on account of its irksomeness; but nothing is hidden that takes place here.' 27 And I desired to understand how it would be known, and he answered me, saying: 'When I shall have caused thee to ascend into the seventh heaven, whence I have been sent, into that which is above these, then thou wilt understand that nothing is concealed from the thrones and from those dwelling in the heavens and from the angels.' And the glory they uttered, and the glory of him sitting on the throne was great, and the angels, who were to the right and left, had greater glory than the heaven which is beneath them. 28 Again, he caused me to ascend into the fourth heaven, and the height of the third to the fourth was greater than from the earth to the firmament. 29 And there again I saw those to the right and to the left, and he sitting on the throne was in the midst, and there too they glorified. 30 And the glory and splendor of the angels to the right was greater than that to the left. 31 And again the splendor of him, who sat on the throne, exceeded that of the angels to the right, whose splendor, however, was greater than theirs who were below. 32 And he caused me to ascend into the fifth heaven. 33 And again I saw those to the right and to the left, and the glory of him who sat on the throne exceeded his who sat in the fourth heaven. 34 And the splendor of those to the right exceeded theirs to the left [from the third to the fourth (proportion)],

35 and the glory of him on the throne was greater than the angels' to the right, 36 and their glory was greater in splendor than that of the fourth heaven. 37 And I glorified Him who is not called by name, the One-Being, who dwells in the heavens, whose name is known to no mortal being, who thus transmits glory from heaven to heaven, who enlarges the glory of the angels, and increases the glory of him who sits on the throne.

VII. 1 And again he caused me to ascend into the air of the sixth heaven, and I saw a glory which I had not seen in the fifth heaven, when I ascended, 2 and angels existing in great splendor, 3 and the glory there was holy and wonderful. 4 And I said to the angel who conducted me: 'What is this that I see, my Lord?' 5 And he said: 'I am not thy Lord, but I am thy companion.' 6 And again I asked and said to him: 'Is there no association of angels?' 7 And he said: 'From the sixth heaven on; above that there is no left, and no throne placed in the midst, but it is of the power of the seventh heaven, where He lives who is not called by name, and His Chosen-one, whose name is not known, nor can all the heavens learn His name, 8 for He is the Only-one, to whose voice all the heavens and the thrones respond. Therefore I have been empowered and sent to cause thee to ascend hither, so that thou couldst see this glory, 9 and see the Lord of all these heavens and of these thrones, but who shall be transformed till He become like your image and your similitude. 11 But I say to thee, Isaiah, no mortal will return to this world, who has seen and ascended and viewed what thou hast viewed, 12 and what thou wilt see, for thou dost participate in a lot of the Lord, in the lot of the tree to come here, and thence is the virtue of the sixth heaven and of the air.' 13 And I extolled the glory of my Lord, because I had come into this lot. 14 And he said: 'Hear further from this thy associate; when from an alien body through the Angel of the Spirit thou didst ascend hither, then thou shalt receive the clothing which thou wilt behold, and other numbered, deposited clothing thou wilt see, 15 and then thou wilt be equal to the angels of the seventh heaven.' 16 And he

caused me to ascend unto the sixth heaven, and there were none to the right, and no throne in the midst, but all were of one kind and of equal glory. 17 And (permission) was given to me, and I glorified with them, and also this angel, and our glorifying was like theirs. 18 And there all called by name the First Father and His Beloved-one, Christ and the Holy Ghost, all with one voice, 19 but the voice was not like that of the angels in the fifth heaven, 20 nor like their conversation, but a different voice was here, and much light was here. 21 And then, when I was in the sixth heaven, I likened to darkness the light which I had seen in the five heavens. 22 And I rejoiced and glorified Him because He had graciously granted this light to those who await His promises. 23 And I entreated the angel who conducted me, that he should not lead me back to the world of the flesh. 24 But I tell you, Hezekiah and Josab, my son, and Micah, that great darkness is here, yes, darkness indeed great. 25 And the angel who conducted me knew what I was thinking of, and said: 'If thou dost rejoice in these lights, how much more in the seventh heaven, when thou wilt behold the lights there where the Lord is and His Beloved-one, whence I am sent, who will be called in the world 'The Son'!' 26 For not yet revealed is He who is to exist in the corruptible world, nor the garments, the thrones, the thrones preserved for the just, for those who believe in that Lord, in Him who will descend in thy image. For the light here is great and wonderful. 27 But as to thy not returning to the flesh again, thy days are not accomplished yet for thy coming here." 28 Hearing this, I grieved, but he said: 'Grieve not!'

IX. 1 And he carried me into the air of the seventh heaven, and again I heard a voice saying: 'Whither will he ascend who dwells among strangers?' And I feared and trembled. 2 And then he said to me, as I trembled: 'Another voice coming from there says: 'Let the holy Isaiah be permitted to ascend hither, for here is his garment.' 3 And I asked the angel who was with me and said: 'Who is he that prevents, and who is he that turns himself toward me that I might ascend?' 4 And he said to me: 'He that pre-

vents, is he upon whom is the splendor of the sixth heaven, 5 and He who turns himself toward thee, is thy God, the Lord Christ, who will be called 'Jesus' in the world, but His name thou canst not hear, till thou hast ascended from thy body.' 6 Then he caused me to ascend into the seventh heaven, and I saw there a wonderful light, and angels without number. 7 And there I saw all the just, who (lived) from the time of Adam, 8 and there I saw Abel, the holy, and all the good, 9 and there I saw Enoch, and all who were with him, relieved of their mortal clothing, and I saw them in their heavenly clothing, and they were like the angels who stand there in great glory; but on their thrones they did not sit, nor were crowns of splendor on their heads. 11 And I asked the angel who was with me: 'How is it that they take these garments and are not on the thrones and with crowns?' 12 And he said to me: 'The thrones and crowns of glory they do not take now, but they do see and know what their thrones and what their crowns shall be, till the Beloved-one descends in the vision in which you have seen Him descend. 13 For He will descend into the world in the last days, as God, who will be called Christ, after He has descended and has become like our image, and is reputed flesh and man. 14 And the God of this world will be revealed through His Son, and they will lay their hands on Him, and will crucify Him on a tree, not knowing who He is. 15 And thus His descent, as thou wilt see, will be concealed from the heavens, and it will not be known who He is. 16 And after He has plundered the angel of death, He will arise on the third (day), and will live in this world five hundred and forty-five days. 17 And then He will ascend away from the saints, many being with Him, whose spirits had not received garments till the Lord Christ ascends, and they ascend with Him. 18 Then therefore, shall they take their garments, and their thrones, and their crowns, when He himself will ascend into the seventh heaven. 19 And I said to Him what I had asked Him in the third heaven, 20 and he said to me: 'Everything in this world that has been done is known here.' 21 Then again I conversed with Him: 'Behold, one of the

angels which stand around is more splendid in glory than that angel who caused me to ascend from the world. 22 And he showed me books, but not like the books of this world, and he opened them, and in the books was writing, but not like the books of this world. And (permission) was given me, and I read them, and behold, the deeds of the children of Israel were written therein, those deeds which thou knowest, my son Josab. 23 And I said: 'In truth, there is nothing concealed in the seventh heaven, which is done in this world.' 24 And I saw there many garments deposited, and many thrones, and many crowns, 25 and I said to the angel who conducted me: 'Whose are these garments, and thrones, and crowns?' 26 And he said to me: 'These garments many in the world will receive, believing the word of Him who, as I have told thee, will be called by name, and will observe them, and will trust in His cross, for them they are deposited.' 27 And I saw a certain one standing, whose glory excelled all, and His glory was great and wonderful. 28 And after I had seen Him, all the saints I had seen, and the angels I had seen, came to Him. And Adam, and Abel, and Seth, and all the saints, first approached, and worshiped Him, and all glorified Him with one voice, and I myself glorified Him with them, and my glorifying was like theirs. 29 Then all the angels approached and worshiped and glorified. 30 And He was transformed and appeared like an angel. 31 And then the angel who conducted me said: 'Now adore,' and I adored and glorified. 32 And the angel said to me: 'This is the Lord of all the glory thou hast seen.' 33 And while I was conversing, I saw another one, glorious, and similar to Him, and the saints approached Him, and worshiped and glorified, and I glorified with them; but His glory was not transformed according to their kind. 34 And then the angels approached and worshiped. 35 And I saw the Lord and a second angel, and they were standing, 36 but the second, whom I saw, was to the left of my Lord. And I asked: 'Who is He?' And he said to me: 'Worship Him, for this is the angel of the Holy Spirit, who speaks by thee and the other saints.' 37 And I saw a great glory as the eyes of my soul were open,

and I was not able to see, as also the angel who was with me, as also all the angels whom I had seen worshiping my Lord; 38 but I saw the saints beholding His splendor with great power. 39 And then my Lord and the angel of the Spirit came to me, and said: 'See, for to thee is given (permission) to behold the Lord, and on thy account, power is given to the angel who is with thee.' 40 And I saw that my Lord worshiped, and the angel of the Holy Ghost, and that both together glorified God. 41 Then all the saints approached and worshiped. 42 And all the saints and the angels approached and worshiped, and all the angels glorified.

X. 1 And then I heard the voices and the glorifications which I had heard in the different six heavens as I ascended thither; 2 all were addressed to that glorious-one, whose glory I was not able to behold, 3 and I myself heard His glory, and I looked, 4 and the Lord and the angel of the Spirit heard all and saw all. 5 And all the glory which was addressed from the six heavens, was not only heard but was also visible. 6 And I heard the angel who conducted me saying: "This is the Highest of the high, who dwells in the sacred world and rests among the saints, who by the Spirit in the mouth of the saints will be called The Father of the Lord. 7 And I heard the words of the Most High, the Father of my Lord, saying to my Lord Christ, who will be called 'Jesus': 8 'Go and descend through all the heavens, and descend through the firmament and this world down to the angel who is in hell, but go not to Perdition (A baddon). 9 and become like the similitude of all of those who are in the five heavens, 10 and like the form of the angels of the firmament, taking care to be assimilated also to the angels of hell. 11 But all the princes of the world will not know thee to be the Lord with me of the seven heavens and their angels, and will not know that thou art with me, 12 and when I will cry with the voice of the heavens, both to their angels and to their luminaries, and when I shall make (this cry) great to the sixth heaven, that you may judge and destroy the princes and the angels and the gods of this world, and the world which is ruled over by them, 13 because

they have denied me and said: 'We alone and none beside us!' 14 And then from the gods of death (*i. e.* dead gods) thou shalt ascend to thy place, and wilt not be transformed in each heaven, but in glory thou wilt ascend and sit at my right, 15 and then the princes and the powers of this world will worship thee.' 16 This I heard the Most glorious-one command my Lord. 17 And this I saw my Lord go from the seventh heaven into the sixth heaven. 18 And the angel, who had conducted me from this world, was with me, and said to me: 'Understand, Isaiah, and see that thou mayest behold the transformation of the Lord and His descent.' 19 And I looked: and when the angels who were in the sixth heaven saw Him, they glorified and praised Him, for He was not transformed into the species of angels who were there, and they glorified Him, and I also glorified with them. 20 And I saw, when he descended into the fifth heaven, and was assimilated to the kind of angels who are in the fifth heaven, they did not glorify Him, for his kind was like their kind. 21 And when He descended into the fourth heaven, He was assimilated to the kind of angels who were there. 22 And when they saw Him they did not glorify nor praise Him, for His kind was like their kind. 23 And again I saw as He descended into the third heaven, He was also assimilated to the kind of angels who were in the third heaven, 24 and they who guarded the gates of the heaven demanded a passport of the Lord, and He gave it to them that He might not be known; and when they saw Him, they did not glorify nor praise him, for his kind was like their kind. 25 And again I saw as He descended into the second heaven, that He gave a passport also there, for they who guarded the gates demanded it, and the Lord gave it. 26 And I saw that He was also assimilated to their kind of angels, who are in the second heaven, and when they saw Him they did not glorify Him, for His kind was like their kind. 27 And again I saw as He descended into the first heaven, and gave a passport to those who guarded the gates, and He was assimilated to the kind of angels who are to the left of the throne, but they did not glorify nor praise Him,

for His kind was like their kind. 28 But me no one questioned as to the angel who conducted me. 29 And again He descended to the firmament where the prince of this world resides, and He gave a passport to those to the left, and His kind was like theirs, and they did not glorify Him here, but each one was contentiously struggling with the other, for here was the power of evil, and contention concerning the smallest (things). 30 And I saw as He descended and was assimilated to the kind of the angels of the air, and He became like one of them. 31 And He did not give a passport because they tore and injured each other.

XI. 1 And after this I looked, and the angel who had conversed with me, who had conducted me, said to me: 'Understand, Isaiah, son of Amos, for to this purpose was I sent by God.' 2 And I looked: from the lineage of David the prophet, there was a woman, whose name was Mary, and she was a virgin, and betrothed to a man, whose name was Joseph, a carpenter, and he too was of the seed of David, the just, who is of Bethlehem in Judea, and He came to his portion. 3 And when she was betrothed she was found pregnant, and Joseph, the carpenter, desired to dismiss her. 4 But the angel of the Spirit appeared in this world, and then Joseph did not dismiss her (Mary,) but he did not reveal this to any one. 5 Neither did he approach Mary, but guarded her as a sacred virgin, although being pregnant. 6 Nor did he live with her two months, 7 and after two whole months, while Joseph was in his house, and Mary too, but both alone, 8 it then happened, as Mary was looking steadily downward with her eyes, she saw a small child, and she was stupified. 9 And after her astonishment, her womb was found as it was before she had conceived. 10 Then her husband, Joseph, said to her: 'Why are you stupified?' and his eyes were opened, and he saw the infant, and he glorified God, because the Lord had come into His portion. 11 And a voice came to them: 'Narrate this vision to no one!' 12 But the story of the infant in Bethlehem was spread abroad. 13 But some said: 'Mary has given

birth before she has been married two months,' 14 and many said: 'She has not given birth, a midwife did not go to her, and we did not hear the cries of pain.' And all were blinded in this matter, for all knew of it, but knew not whence it was. 15 And they took it (*i. e.* the infant) and went to Nazareth in Galilee. 16 And I saw Hezekiah and Josab, my son, and spoke to other prophets standing there, that it was hidden from all the heavens and all the princes, and every god of this world. 17 And I looked: in Nazareth He sucked as an infant, as is custom, that He might not be known. 18 And when He had grown up, He did great signs and wonders in the land of Israel and of Jerusalem. 19 And then the Adversary became jealous of Him, and excited the children of Israel against Him, not knowing who He was, and they brought Him to the king, and crucified Him, and He descended to the angel of hell. 20 But in Jerusalem I saw Him crucified on a tree, 21 and after three days rising and remaining (some) days. 22 And the angel who conducted me said: 'Understand, Isaiah:' and I saw Him sending twelve disciples, and ascend. 23 And I saw Him, and He was in the firmament, but was not assimilated to their kind, and all the angels of the firmament saw Him, even Satan, and worshiped Him. 24 Great was the grief there when they said: 'How did our Lord descend over us, and we did not know the glory which was over us, which was over Him, which we saw was above Him, from the sixth heaven.' 25 And He ascended into the second heaven, but was not transformed, but all the angels who were to the right and to the left, and the throne in the midst, 26 both worshiped and glorified Him and said: 'How was our Lord concealed from us as He descended, and we did not know it?' 27 And thus He ascended into the third heaven, and thus they glorified and spoke. 28 And in the fourth and fifth heavens they said the same. 29 But the glory was one, and He was not changed from it. 30 And I saw as He ascended into the sixth heaven, they worshiped and glorified Him, 31 and in all the heavens the glorifying increased. 32 And I saw how He ascended into the seventh heaven, and

all the saints and all the angels glorified him. And then I saw Him sitting on the right hand of the Most Glorious-One, of whom I have said that I could not behold His glory. 33. And the angel of the Holy Ghost I saw sitting to the left. 34 An angel said to me: 'Isaiah, son of Amos, I preserve thee, for these things are great, for thou hast seen what no son of the flesh has seen, 35 and now return to thy garments, until thy days are completed, then thou shalt come here.' This I saw. 36 And Isaiah spoke to all who stood before him, and they glorified. And he conversed with Hezekiah, the king, and said: 'Such things have I spoken, 37 and also the consummation of this world, 38 and this whole vision will be accomplished in the last generation.' 39 And Isaiah made them swear that they would not relate this to the children of Israel, and that these words be not given to man to be perverted. 40 But *then* ye may read them. But be ye in the Holy Spirit, that ye may receive your garments and thrones and crowns of glory, deposited in the seventh heaven. 41 On account of these visions and prophecies, Sammael Satan, through Manasseh, sawed Isaiah, the son of Amos, the prophet, asunder. 42 And all this Hezekiah gave to Manasseh in the twenty-sixth year, 43 but Manasseh did not remember nor place these things in his heart, but serving Satan he was destroyed.

[Here ends (the book) of Isaiah, the prophet, with his ascension.]

III. EXPLANATORY NOTES.

Chap. I. 2 *Seen*, because it was a vision. Cf. Deut. 4 : 9. אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־רָאָה. Iosab, who is an important person in the *Ascensio*, is Ἰασούβ, יֵשׁוּב, Is. 7 : 3. 3 Ἀγγελοι, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις. 4. Beloved-one, a biblical and apocalyptic appellation of Christ. 5 *Samnas*, שְׁכַנָּא, *e. g.*, Is. 36. 3 שְׁכַנָּא הַסֵּפֶר, LXX. Σομνάς ὁ γραμματεὺς. Cf. Is. 36 : 11, 22; 37 : 2. II. Reg. 18 : 18, 26. This v. gives, in general terms, the contents of the whole book. 7 *Not in the presence of M. alone*, *i. e.*, Iosab too was present, cf. v. 6.

As *God liveth*, like the Heb. **חַי יְהוָה**, *e. g.* II. Sam. 12 : 5. 8 *Sammael*, **סַמְאֵל**, a name of Satan, common in later Jewish theology. Cf. Buxdorf, *Lex. Chal.* He is the **מוֹדָא מְלַאךְ**, angel of death, "a great prince in heaven," and the great "tempter" of Eve, cf. Laurence, p. 162 ff. . Malkira, **מַלְכִירַע**, *i. e.* king of evil, **מֶלֶךְ** and **רַעַע**. *Berial*, or *Beriar*, according to the well-known change of *r* and *l*. **בְּלִיעֵל** (from **בְּלִי** *non, sine*, and **רַעַל**, *commodum, utilitas*, hence=*homo nequam, vastator*), as *Βελίαρ* in 2 Cor. 6 : 15, and in the Sibylline books and apocryphal writings, a name for Satan, Cf. Gesenius, *Thesaurus* I., p. 210. *Βελίαρ* is a better form than *Βελίαλ*.—The matter spoken of in v. 7—13, is discussed with reference to the name Manasseh, in a commentary on Matth. wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom: "Providentia autem Dei sic (*i. e.* ex radice **נִשְׁה** *oblivisci*) eum dispensavit vocari, quia *obliturus fuerat omnem conversationem patris sui sanctam*, * * *et stimulatus ab insurgente Diabolo*,—qui solet insurgere super (cf. II. 2) genus humanum ad evertendum, gesturus omnia, quae ad iracundiam provocarent." Then follows an account given here in these verses.

Chap. II. 1 *Remember*, cf. **נִשְׁה** *oblivisci*. 4 Matanbukus found as Mekembekus in chap. 5 : 3. 5 These names have not yet been satisfactorily explained. Foreign names are often distorted terribly in Ethiopic, *e. g.* "The vision of John Abu-Kalemmis," (*i. e.* ἀποκάλυψις). Cf. Dillmann, p. 66. 6 Imitation of biblical language. 12 *Saducias*, the same as Ezechias v. 16, cf. I. Reg. 22 : 11, 24. In the *Chronicon Pasch.* are mentioned Ἐζεκιᾶς καὶ Ἐλιέζεφ as ψευδοπροφηταί; and afterwards Σεδεκίας καὶ Ἐλιέζεφ. 13 A corrupted passage, hence the translation is uncertain. Ochozia is Ὀχοζίας, **אֲחִזְיָה**.

Chap. III. *Tazon*, *i. e.* Γωζάν, 2 Reg. 17 : 6, and 18 : 11, where some read Ταγάν.—9 cf. Ex. 33 : 20; Is. 6 : 1. Origen quotes this verse in his homily on Is. I.: "Ajunt ideo Isiam esse sectum a populo, quasi legem prævaricantem, et

extra Scripturas annunciantum. *Scriptura enim dicit; 'Nemo videbit faciem meam et vivet.' Iste vero ait: 'Vidi Dominum Sabbath.'* *Moses, aiunt, non vidit, et tu vidisti.*"—10 cf. Is. 1 : 10. 13 This verse gives even a clearer index to the whole work than chap. 1 : 4,—*before the Sabbath, i. e. the day before the Sabbath*, the *προσάββατον* of Mark 15 : 42.—15 cf. *οἱ ἄγγελου τῶν ἐπτά ἐκκλησιῶν*, Apoc. 1 : 20, and *τῷ ἄγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας*, Apoc. 2 : 1.—16 *i. e. the chief of the holy angels.*—18 *His assumption is still the object of will teach.* 22 cf. 2 Pet. 3 : 1—10. cf. Clem. Rom. 1 : 3.—23 *office, i. e. τιμή.*—26 *Naked honor*,=κενοδοξία.—28 *Love of gold, φιλαργυρία.*

Chap. IV. 2 *A matricide*, (Nero) cf. Sibyl. Books 4, 120 seq.; 5, 142 seq.; 361 seq.—4 and ff refer to the Christian persecutions.—5 cf. 4 Ez. 5 : 4.—6 cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 4; Apoc. 13 : 5.—7 cf. Apoc. 13 : 4, 8, 12.—9 cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 3.—10 cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 9; Apoc. 13 : 14, 19 : 20; Matt. 24 : 24.—11 cf. Apoc. 13 : 14, 15, 14 : 11.—12 cf. Apoc. 13 : 5; cf. Dillmann, notes.—14 *The one thousand* is doubtful.—15 cf. Is. 24 : 23.—16 cf. later.—19 the מִשְׁכַּב בְּבֶל Is. 13 : 1.—LXX. ὄρασις ἣν εἶδεν Ἡσαΐας κατὰ Βαβαλῶνος.—22 cf. concerning Joseph Just. Nitzsch, Theol. Stud. u. Krit., Vol. II., p. 228 seq., and Ewald, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel. I., p. 602. Ed. III.

Chap. V. 4—8 quoted by Ambrosius to Psalm 118.—14 cf. Tertul. de patientia 14.

Chap. VI. 6 indicates the approach of the Holy Ghost.—8 cf. Is. 57 : 15.—13 the angel comes from the highest heaven, hence directly from God, cf. Dillmann.—17 Ijoagem, cf. Is. 36 : 3, אֱלִיָּהוּ, Ἐλιακίμ. Asaph l. c. יִצְחָק בֶּן אֶסָּף --'Ιωάχ ό τοῦ Ἀσάφ.

Chap. VII. 14 Cf. Col. 1 : 16. 18 *The and before firmament* is epexegetical=*even*. This chapter presents many Gnostic ideas. 37 θεὸς ἄπρητος, cf. 8 : 7.

Chap. VIII. 5 Dillmann thinks this, as well as "Christ," chap. 8 : 18 and 9 : 5, 13, 17; 10 : 7, are *additamenta spuria*. 9 Cf. Henoch 62 : 15, 16; 2 Cor. 5 : 3, 4; Apoc. 3 : 4, 5—16.

545 days, *i. e.* one year and six months of 180 days. Cf. for similar opinion of some Gnostics, Irenæus Adv. Hæc. I., 1:5, and 1:34. 22 Cf. Dan. 7:20; Henoch 89:70 seq. 90:14, 17, 20, 98:6—8; 106:19; 107:1; 108:7: Apoc. 20:12; 4 Ezr. 6:20.

Chap. X. 8 Hell—*היא*, not Gehenna as in chap. I. Cf. Apoc. 9:11, 17:8. 16 *τὸν τῆς, μεγάλης δόξας.*

Chap. XI. 3 By His birth. Cf. Protevang. Jacobi 8 and 9 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἱερεὺς· σὺ κεκλήρωσαι τὴν παρθένον κυρίου παραλαβεῖν· παράβαλε αὐτὴν εἰς τήρησιν σεαυτῷ. 16 Cf. Ignat. ad Eph. 19, ad Philip. 8 and 9.

ARTICLE IV.

STUDIES IN GOSPEL HARMONY.

By Rev. W. H. SETTLEMYER, A. M., Jefferson, Md.

The harmony of the Gospels has elicited the special attention of many for centuries, and not without gratifying results. The more they are studied, the more are the Gospels found to be reliable, not only in spirit, but in letter.

It is remarked by travelers in Syria, that in relation to customs, manners, habits, &c., they have often been surprised at the literal accuracy of the gospel narrative. Any one carefully reading the Evangelists, cannot but notice the simplicity of the style, and the straightforward manner of relating events. This circumstance leads us to expect a harmony in the various statements, and not in vain, for with but few seeming exceptions, the Gospels harmonize in a manner most remarkable. It is also observable that the more the student enters into the spirit of the Gospels, and correctly conceives such related circumstances as may attend them, together with an insight into the feelings and sympathies common to human nature in every age, the less will he find that refuses to be harmonized, even in verbal accuracy.

At present it is only proposed to make a few observations

in relation to the incidents connected with, and following after, the death and resurrection of Christ.

In the different accounts of the women to the sepulchre of Christ, the reader must have noticed the difference in the various statements of the Evangelists, and only on a very careful comparison is it manifest, how beautifully these various statements complement one another. No less remarkably do Christ's appearances to His followers, on the first day after His resurrection, unravel in harmony with facts explicitly set forth.

When by the comparison and arrangement of facts, one may be able to find their bearing upon, and relation to each other, there ought not in that case, to be any attempt to harmonize the given facts with any preconceived notion of events, but the consistency of these events should find its harmony in the chronological order of the given facts.

As these facts are the only clew by which these questions—the order in which Mary Magdalene and the other women visited the sepulchre, and saw the angels; and the order of Christ's appearance to His followers on the first day after His resurrection—may be determined, it will be found necessary to examine a few expressions relating to the points at issue.

In Matt. 28 : 1, we have it said: "*In the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre.*"

In first referring to this passage, it is designed to show that some of the transactions, usually referred to the first natural day (from sunrise to sunset) of the week, *i. e.* after the night following the Sabbath (or seventh day) had passed, really belonged to the evening of the previous natural day. It is well known, that instead of beginning the civil day with midnight, as is our custom, the Israelites began to reckon their civil day from the evening of the natural day, or about sunset, (Lev. 23 : 32, and Luke 4 : 40). Keeping this circumstance in mind, there will be little difficulty in tracing the line of events. Luke refers, (24 : 1), to previously prepared spices, which were prepared on the preceding sixth day (Friday), and in the evening of that day, before the time of

sunset ushered in the Sabbath (23 : 54—56). This is manifest from the fact that Christ's body was removed before the day of preparation closed, and the spices were not prepared until after that event, but before the Sabbath set in. This fact serves to show the readiness and eager promptness which some of the women exhibited in reference to their ministrations to Christ. By obtaining this portraiture of their love and activity, we are aided in the comprehension of their subsequent movements. Professing obedience, however, to the law concerning the Sabbath, they rested from their works of benefaction, (v. 56) but completed their arrangements after the Sabbath, *i. e.* before the night, that followed the seventh civil day, intervened, by purchasing some sweet spices in addition to those already prepared on the evening of the sixth civil day, Mark 16 : 1. Thus far was the preparation completed before the night, preceding the first natural day of the week, intervened; "and very early in the morning, the first [natural] day of the week, they came to the sepulchre."

Their promptness and energy in laboring up to the hour of the Sabbath, and immediately after the Sabbath, in their preparations, with their known love for Christ; and also the manner of expression here used by the Evangelist, plainly indicate their anxious care for the body of Christ, that it might receive the attention which would naturally be given to one who had been greatly beloved. Already had Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, the mother of Joses and James, visited the tomb, previous to the Sabbath, and beheld where they had laid Him, (Mark 15 : 47 and Matt 27 : 56 and 61); and in their love for their Saviour, it would seem but natural that after the Sabbath, and before they reposed for the night, that they should again visit the tomb. This, according to Matthew 28 : 1, as above indicated, is the fact in the case.

We are aware that some of our best biblical exegetes seek to harmonize Matt. 28 : 1, with Mark 16 : 2, Luke 24 : 1, and John 20 : 1, but close investigation evidently shows this to be a mistake. The cause of every attempt to bring these passages into harmony seems to lie in the apparent signification

of τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ ("in the dawning"), for it is almost exclusively referred, by exegetes, to the morning or dawn of the natural day, (about 6 A. M.) instead of the dawn or beginning of the civil day, (about 6 P. M.)

That this event refers to the dawn of the civil day, is shown in Luke 23 : 54, where, at, or immediately after the burial of Christ, we are told that the Sabbath was drawing on (ἐπέφωσκε, "was dawning"). Here the application of ἐπέφωσκειν to the *dawning of the civil day* is unequivocally fixed by parallel passages, in Matt. 27 : 57, and Mark 15 : 42. In the former, the time of the burial of the body of Jesus is designated by Ὁφίας δε γενομένης "when the even was come." The latter passage marks the time still more definitely. Καὶ ἡδὴ ὁφίας γενομένης (ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστὶ προσάββατον.) "And now when the even was come, (because it was preparation, that is the day before the Sabbath)." This occasion of Joseph's claiming the body of Christ for burial, ere the hour of sunset, (compare Luke 4 : 40) should usher in the *dawning* or beginning of the civil sabbath day, gives us, without any doubt, the signification of ἐπιφωσκειν, as used in Luke 23 : 54. And this word, used in the same connection of events, even the marking of the approach of the same hour, the dawning of the Sabbath, is most appropriately applied in the same sense to Matt. 28 : 1; and in fact cannot by any law of exegesis be referred to any other time than that fixed by the exegesis of Luke 23 : 54, unless such sense be excluded by some controlling circumstance. In the instances cited there is a clear and near proximity of time between ὄψε or ὁφίας and ἐπιφωσκειν. The first pointing to the last hour, or more properly to the close of the civil day; and the last to the immediate entrance of the following civil day. If, then, in the detailed account of this same event, the same words are used, not separately as above, but in connection, can there be any doubt as to their signification? Ὁψε δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκόνσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, "late in the Sabbath (*i. e.* after or at the end of the Sabbath) in the dawning unto the first of the week," from the use of

ὄψε and ἐπιφωσκειν above, has a double reference to the dawn of the civil day, and cannot well be otherwise understood. Moreover, Matthew proceeds to mention the earthquake, the descent of the angel, his rolling away the stone, and sitting on it, and the terror of the watch, *after* the visit of the women to the sepulchre, which also implies that his account of the visit (28 : 1) refers to the dawn of the civil day, and in the evening of the natural day before the resurrection.

Mark also refers to these two Marys when the Sabbath was past, as actively engaged in preparing for work on the coming morning (16 : 1); but none of the evangelists use ἐπιφωσκειν to describe the opening of the natural day, in fact, if we mistake not, it is used in the N. T. in no other sense than to describe the inauguration of the civil day, and only in this connection.

As further evidence, on this point, we quote the following definition entire of ἐπιφωσκειν from Pickering's Classical Greek Lexicon: "To shine forth, to appear; to dawn, Matt. 28 : 1; the Jews reckoned their days from sunset; and, in Syriac, the word corresponding to ἐπιφωσκειν is also applied to the evening preceding any day.—Gesenius in Class. Journ., xxvii, 160."

This interpretation of this passage is neither unnatural nor constrained in any sense, nor is it out of harmony with any stated occurrence, but in perfect accordance with the tenor of events, and the given use of terms here employed.

This leaves us but three accounts concerning the visits of the women to the sepulchre to harmonize. In doing this, it will avail us to note particularly the expressions of the evangelists concerning the morning visits, to observe whether they readily agree.

In reviewing these accounts, it is but just to take a natural and fair signification from plain and easy statements, and a naturally applied sense from words not so definite. In John 20 : 1, we learn that Mary Magdalene visited the tomb while it was yet dark, (σκοτίας ἔτι οὕσης), while Mark says (16 : 2), "they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." Literally, "the sun having arisen," or *after* sunrise, rather than *at* sunrise (ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου). Here we have two ex-

press and definite statements, that ought not to be attempted to be harmonized, unless other facts equally definite bring in a statement directly antagonistic, *i. e.* a statement *requiring* the given expressions to be harmonized. This requisition cannot be made unless any one of the evangelists, or other equally reliable historian, expressly states that all the women *went together* to the sepulchre in the morning. But this is nowhere done, for neither Mark nor Luke asserts that Mary Magdalene was with the other women when they visited the sepulchre in the morning. There have been attempts to show that Mark's "after sunrise" was modified by the accompanying *λίαν πρωί* ("very early"); but this expressions has no definite signification, as is evident from Mark's own use of it. For whenever he would speak definitely, he limits the *λίαν πρωί* by some other word or phrase. Here he distinctly states that *λίαν πρωί* has reference to the time after sunrise. In chap. 1, v. 35, he just as distinctly states that it has reference to the time of night. *Καὶ πρωὶ ἐννυχὸς λίαν*; "And in the morning, rising up a great while *before day*, he went out, * * and there prayed." Then it is plain, that *λίαν πρωί* (very early) should not be regarded as the *specific* phrase, but as a *generic*, and subject to modification. In this case, by Mark's own use of it, it becomes, instead of the adjunct, the principal chronological phrase, and is itself modified by the adjunct phrase *ἀνατελλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*, "the sun having arisen." The position of the Greek phrase (*ἀνατελλαντος*, &c.), holds also a subordinate place in the sentence to the *λίαν*, &c., which gives the same evidence as the author's varied use of the Greek phrases above cited. Then if John's "while it was yet *dark*" will not agree with Mark's "the sun *having arisen*," or, as the English version has it, "at the rising of the sun," Mary Magdalene must have gone alone while it was yet dark, and the others must have delayed until after sunrise, in their morning visit to the sepulchre.

Why should we not expect this, for Mary Magdalene was doubtless the same who had the most forgiven, and consequently loved the most? No doubt Mary Magdalene expect-

ed to be back again to help embalm, but owing to the resurrection, as we shall hereafter see, was by circumstances still kept apart from the others. There is no reason why we should not consider the visit of Mary Magdalene to the tomb, as occurring earlier in the morning of the natural day than the visit of the other women. The succeeding events, to which reference will be had hereafter, evidence the same. What place, therefore, does Luke's *ὄρθρου βαθείας* obtain in the chronological order of events? Can this expression be made to correspond with either of the other accounts, or does it also mark a definite time of its own; or in general correspond with all the others?

A few classical definitions, with others, will aid us just here. *ὄρθρος βαθύς*, say Liddell and Scott, signifies the first dawn. *βαθύς* is defined the "morning-prime." *ὄρθρος*, they add in an etymological note, is from *ορνυμι*, Latin, *orior*; *ορθός*, "the rising of the sun."

Pickering gives substantially the first definition above. Robinson says, it is the time before and about daybreak, while one still needs a light; but later, also, including the morning twilight until near sunrise.

Schleusner says: *Ter tantum legitur in N. T. Luc 24 : 1; ὄρθρου βαθείας, scilicet ὄντος, primo mane.* "Only thrice is it [*ορθρός*] to be found in the N. T. Luke 24 : 1, [the other two being Jno. 8 : 2, and Acts 5 : 21]; "*ορθρου βαθείας*, supply *ὄντος*, [being] early in the morning."

This phrase then seems, at least as Robinson defines it, to agree with the statement of John, while Liddell and Scott's definition makes the time very nearly coincide with Mark's time of sunrise.

The general idea of the time included in the above phrase, however, seems to correspond quite well with *λίαν πρῶτον*, and may signify any time included in the phrase "very early;" ranging, in all probability, between the definite expressions of John and Mark. Doubtless Luke had the early visit of Mary Magdalene in his mind, when he wrote, as he afterward included her with the rest, but, evidently, without again referring to the time, he includes the later visit of the others

in a general statement. This is inferred from the manner in which he mingles circumstances, which, when considered chronologically, are distinctly stated by the others. Instancing the general manner in which he groups the distinctly stated facts of the other Gospels, especially their telling "all these things to *the eleven, and to all the rest,*" as if all the disciples had been together, and had received the intelligence at the same time. The circumstance of Peter alone going to the sepulchre, in Luke's account, *after* the women had "told all these thing to the eleven and to all the rest," and also that Peter went from among the company of "the eleven and all the rest,"—when all other accounts record what would be naturally expected, that all the disciples that heard, in the early part of the day, of Christ's resurrection, and before they saw him, hastened to the tomb—moreover impresses one with the idea that Luke spoke in general terms. Even Mary Magdalene is represented by Luke as being with the rest, when she went to the tomb in the morning of the *natural* day, which seems inconsistent with the facts stated, for she is represented as seeing the Lord *at* the sepulchre, the others *on the way* home, she saw him *first*, therefore must have been alone, &c. The only natural explanation appertaining to Luke's gospel, is to regard him as hastily passing over such statements as the others had given more fully and chronologically. In consistency with the fact that he passed rapidly over items of occurrences noticed more definitely by the other gospels, (for the Spirit, Jno. 14 : 26, in bringing all things to *their* remembrance, not to *each one's* remembrance, accorded to Luke this part of the narrative), he gives us the only full account of the interview between Christ and the two disciples on the way to Emmaus. In consequence of this interview, we obtain an additional reason for believing that Mary Magdalene went while it was yet dark, apart from the others, and the others after sunrise, to the sepulchre.

The two who went on the same day to Emmaus report, that "certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre, and when they found not

his body, they came saying that they had also seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive," (Luke 24 : 22, 23).

It is presumable that in every case where there is a direct testimony that Christ had been seen, it is so reported as a positive confirmation of his resurrection (Jno. 20 : 18). In fact the women were charged to report at once, to the disciples, the testimony of the angels concerning the resurrection. This report of the angels is doubtless all the testimony they had to give, for, had they seen Jesus, like Mary Magdalene, they would have so testified; the inference, therefore, is, that they had not seen him—from which it is plain that Mary Magdalene was not with the rest, as she saw both Christ and the angels at the same time.

Again, they report that they found not the body, a report utterly inconceivable had they seen Christ. Mary saw Christ at the tomb, the others on the way home, from which it is quite apparent that Mary was both separate from the rest, and *first* saw the Lord.

After the "other women" told some of the disciples, they (other disciples probably than Peter and John) also went to the tomb (v. 24), and found it as the women had said, but because they saw Him not, they doubted of the truth of the statement (v. 25), and could not satisfy themselves with what they had heard and seen. If then they found it as the women had said, they *had not said* that they had seen Christ, for from their doubts it is sure the disciples had not seen him. Taking in consideration also how ready these same men were to testify directly of Christ's resurrection, and with what haste they returned to Jerusalem to tell of the things by the way, and how he had made himself known to them; we have, *prima facie* evidence that the women, who informed Cleopas and his companion of Christ's resurrection, had not as yet seen Christ.—Therefore Christ must have met the women in the way after they had informed Cleopas and his companion, and may be others, that they had seen the vision of angels.

From these data it is easy to trace the order of the women's visits to the sepulchre.

1. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, and perhaps some others, were present (Friday evening before 6 P. M.) when Christ's body was laid in the tomb. Mark 15 : 47 ; Luke 23 : 55, &c.

2. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary visited the tomb soon as the civil Sabbath was ended, (Saturday evening after 6 P. M.) Matt 28 : 1. This visit was made after *they rested on the Sabbath*, Luke 23 : 56.

3. Mary Magdalene visited the tomb before daylight of the next natural day (Lord's day or Sunday), as it is distinctly stated by John (20 : 1). Then she ran and told Peter and John who went to the tomb, saw only the clothes, and returned. Mary doubtless followed them back to the tomb, and after Peter and John left, stood without weeping, then stooped down to look into the sepulchre, and saw two angels, and immediately after saw Jesus *at the sepulchre*, and was the only one to see him there, as well as the *first one*. Then she returned and informed the disciples she had seen the Lord.

4. After sunrise, the other women visited the tomb to complete the embalming of Christ's body, as related by Mark (16 : 2). But they found a young man (angel, Matt. 28 : 5 ; two men, Luke 24 : 4,) in the sepulchre, who declared that Jesus was not *there*, but "goeth into Galilee;" and, fearing, they fled, "neither said they anything to any" one of their own company, *i. e.* they did not comment among themselves on the way concerning the things told them by the angel, or angels, but "they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy ; and did run to bring his disciples word." Matt. 28 : 8 ; Luke 24 : 9. To supply "*man*" in Mark 16 : 8, is not necessary to complete the sense of the sentence, but is contradicted in Matt. and Luke, as quoted above. And it is quite in conformity with the tenor of events, to presume that as they ran in haste and great joy, even with trembling and amazement, that they did not say anything to each other as they *ran* to declare the tidings to the disciples.

By the way they met some disciples, Cleopas and his companion, and perhaps others: then they met Jesus, who re-

peated to them their commission to go and tell the disciples to meet him in Galilee.

It next remains to be seen, in what order Christ appeared to His disciples on the first day of the week. Mark says positively (16:9), that Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene; nor is there any difficulty, as some (Robinson's Greek Harmony, p. 232) allege, in assuming this literal statement. In following the order of time that the facts already investigated have given, and the hints or allusions given by the various incidents recorded, there can be no difficulty as to Mary's having first seen the Lord.

She, after the evening visit in company with the other Mary, went out alone in the morning before dawn, and finding to her surprise that her Lord was gone from the sepulchre, she ran to tell Peter and John of the circumstance.

The expression *οἶδαμεν* "We know," (used in the plural as though the women of that company were together,) which is found in this connection, presents no difficulty in its application to Mary alone, for it falls in with the current mode of expression (*usus loquendi*) both of that day, (see John 3:2) and of the present day. Then Peter and John went to the sepulchre, and into it; but saw neither the angels nor the Lord, after which they also returned home. Mary Magdalene evidently returned to the sepulchre with them, or immediately after them, as they ran with celerity, and not knowing what next to do, "stood without the sepulchre weeping, and as she stooped down and looked into the sepulchre she saw two angels in white." And as they spake to her, she again lamented the absence of her Lord's body, (lamenting before to Peter and John), but on turning, probably having heard the approach of some one, she saw her Lord, whom she on first sight mistook for the gardner. Thus she saw the Lord and the angels at the same time and place. Besides the general impression that Mary Magdalene was alone at the tomb, as it may also be inferred from John (20:1), we have the account of the two who went to Emmaus, giving us important intimations here also. As already seen and for reasons given above, the other women,

after they left the tomb, met the disciples, before Jesus appeared to them. It would seem unnatural, however possible it might be, that Christ should first go away from the tomb to appear to the other women, and afterward return to appear to Mary—but much more probable, that when He left it He returned not again. Then, as Christ must have met the other women some distance from the tomb; for they, from the tenor of their conversation with the disciples, Cleopas and others, had seen the angels, and informed these disciples previous to having met their risen Lord; it is only natural to conclude, as He appeared to Mary at the tomb, that, in accordance with Mark, He appeared to her first. This conclusion is strengthened from the events recorded. Mary went out before daylight, and had ample time to go to the tomb, which was hard by the city (afterward in the city), and, seeing that the body was gone, to run and tell Peter and John; to return with them, and after they were gone, to look again in the sepulchre, to more fully assure herself that the body was not there, and instead of the body, see the angels, and Jesus, and to depart to tell the rest as Christ bade her, before the other women appeared, or even left their home; which occurred after sunrise. When the other women came they saw the angels only, for Christ was gone (Mark 16 : 6). They were also told by the angels to go and tell the disciples. After they left the tomb as directed by the angels, they saw the two, Cleopas and his companion, and perhaps others; then they met Christ on the way. In all probability, having before sent special word to him (Mark 16 : 7) he next appeared to Peter, because we are told that *the day was far spent* when “he appeared in another form,” to the two on the way to Emmaus; and a report was among the disciples that the Lord had appeared to Simon when the two returned. Then as the two were speaking of Christ, and were relating the wonderful things they had heard and seen, Christ again appears in their midst. This makes up the sum of his recorded manifestations for that day.

We cannot do otherwise than record our admiration for
Vol. VIII. No. 4

the natural beauty and expression displayed in the narration of these events; and how perfectly they shadow forth the more delicate tints of real life. The most fitting conclusion that we can add to the complementary character of the Gospels, evinced in this fragmentary study of Christ's life, is an extract from the pen of the late Dr. Jas. Hamilton:

"The more delicate these coincidences are, the surer is the inference from them. If you were comparing a check with a check-book from which it was said to be taken, and found not only the cut portion to correspond with the counterfoil, but if on microscopic examination the torn corner finely coincided—if you found its rough and ragged edge and each riven portion to match exactly the surface from which it was said to be sundered, you could no longer doubt that the piece of paper in your hand had been taken from that book. And these delicate agreements of one Evangelist with the other show that their story is an extract from the book of truth, a leaf from the volume of actual occurrence, a derivation from a counterpart original."

ARTICLE V.

"THE POWER OF DARKNESS."

By Rev. H. L. Dox, Tremont, Pa.

"But this is your hour and the power of darkness."

"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness."

Power is "mental or moral ability to act;" to induce, concentrate, or control action; to so exercise, or regulate force as to secure results.

Darkness is the absence of light. The *power of darkness* is its tendency to occasion evil, or to obstruct good. As it occurs in the passages of Scripture given above, the expression means *the combined influence of Evil Spirits arrayed against the economy of grace.*

Of this class of beings the Holy Scriptures are the only reliable source of information. The mythological ideas, more

or less prevalent, it is more than probable, were originally derived from the sacred writings of the Hebrews.

In the study of this subject, accordingly, it is not worth while to give any attention to the endlessly diversified superstitions of the ancients. The river at its mouth, impregnated with foreign substances held in solution, proves nothing respecting its waters at the fountain head.

It is a common practice, in the investigation of the more obscure doctrines of Revelation, to give great prominence to arguments of a philological character. Terms are traced to their origin with a view to their etymological significance. In these processes it doubtless some times happens that the classics interpret the Scriptures. Such researches *may* be worse than useless. Very little attention to the laws of language will satisfy any one, that words cannot be carried through all their transitional liabilities with precision enough to make *definitions* the foundation of religious faith. The student, at last, is usually left to make his choice between conflicting lexicographers and exegetes.

In studying the subject now before us, may we hopefully invoke the wisdom of the Fathers? Will a pilgrimage through the vast and not very clearly defined field of research thus indicated, promise compensation? Chasms will be found which can only be bridged by conjecture. In endeavoring to fix upon the polar point we may find ourselves in an open sea. About ancestral opinions how many doubtful disputations!

Upon what foundation, then, does the belief in the existence and personality of beings, holding intermediate rank between God and man, rest?

Not surely, upon the testimony of the senses. Whether or not it be admitted that devils are sometimes objects of such cognition, the claim of personality must rest on other proof. Nor is this point reached by the consciousness that evil influences are brought to bear upon us. This may be corroborative and explanatory, but in itself is not conclusive. The question, whether the grand chain of agencies in the Divine economy is complete, without some intervening link

between God and man, is germane: but the answer, be it what it may, will not cover the case. Their is no authority for the assumption that any order of angelic beings are supplemental to either God or man. The distance between them should not indeed be overlooked. But upon speculation in regard to it, we cannot make much dependence. It is too vague. And the same thing may be said respecting the general belief on this subject. That it is of great antiquity and well nigh approximates universality, there can be no doubt. But, as already intimated, this belief, most likely, originated in the earliest revelations made to man, and has been traditionally propagated, from generation to generation and from one nation to another. In fact, fruitful sources of suggestion upon many other subjects are unavailable respecting this. Reason is mainly silent until conclusions have been arrived at from the "law and the testimony." Hence we appeal to this infallible touch stone of truth.

From Genesis to Revelation we find frequent, and often very emphatic, allusions to Evil Spirits. And the first question which claims attention is, Do they denote *personalities*, or *personifications*? Do the names DEVIL, SATAN, BEELZEBUB, and others of like import, indicate beings or qualities? Does the Devil exist independently of all other beings, as does man? Or are the attributes of distinctive entities ascribed to him and his evil associates as figures of speech?

An exhaustive view of this single inquiry would of itself require the space allotted to the entire article. And it is not probable that even such a view would dissipate the doubts of the skeptical. The truth is, that all, or nearly all, who deny the personality of evil spirits, deny also the Bible as an authoritative revelation. Hence, to offer Bible proof to those who reject the Bible, would be equivalent to casting pearls before swine. But to answer the objections which infidels urge against the Christian system, is not the main object of Scriptural researches and doctrinal discussions. The faith of the believer needs development and expansion. Accordingly, a brief statement of the proof by which the personality of Satan is established may not here be out of place.

It is just as easy to prove the personality of Satan as it is to prove the personality of Pontius Pilate. And the argument is equally conclusive. Without indulging in the licentious logic of modern skeptics, a logic which annihilates the very idea of subjective existence, it is no more possible to set aside the personality of Satan, than it is to set aside the personality of Adam and Eve. The fall of our first parents, as set forth in the Mosaic narrative, furnishes overwhelming testimony that the tempter was as much a person as was either of the tempted. But our purpose will be better subserved by directing attention to the teachings of the New Testament, with which all classes are presumed to be more familiar.

The manner in which Christ and the Apostles spake on this subject, should be carefully considered. Their utterances were subjected to the severest scrutiny, and it is not, accordingly, presumable that under divine guidance they overlooked any liabilities to misconstruction or misrepresentation.

With the exception of the Sadducees, all the different sects of the Jews believed in the doctrine of angels and spirits. And it is quite evident that by angel and spirit, they understood spiritual beings. Now all the teachers and writers of the New Testament fully understood the prevalent belief on this subject. And yet they made no issue with it. They endorsed it without qualification. Nay, more; they taught it as understood by the people. And the passages which justify this statement are too numerous, too familiar, too unmistakable in their meaning, to render either quotation or exposition at all necessary. Accordingly, there is but a single alternative. Either Christ and the Apostles practiced the most inexcusable prevarication, or the doctrine of the personality of Satan, as believed by the Jews, is true. And with the Christian this settles the question. Christ and the Apostles are no more liable to the charge of conniving at error, than they are of teaching it.

Again: the New Testament clearly recognizes in the great spiritual adversary, all the essential characteristics of person-

ality. Only three of these characteristics need to be noticed; *perception, judgment, volition*. If it is found that these constitutional elements of personality belong to him, from the conclusion claimed there is no escape. Out of the many passages which might be cited, only a few will be examined.

The first to which we call attention is Matt. 4 : 9. Another is 2 Tim. 2 : 26. A third is 1 Pet. 5 : 8. To economize space, we make the references without the quotations. The reader is desired to turn to them.

Now, whatever else these texts do or do not teach, they do teach that the Devil possessed and exercised *perception, judgment, volition*. There was clearly an apprehension of an *end* sought to be secured. As clearly there was judgment in the selection of the *means* to be used in securing that end. And not less clearly was there a *determinative volition* to use those means with a view to that end. The *end* was to obtain personal supremacy over those upon whom the power of the Devil was brought to bear. The *means* were the presentation of such motives, and the exercise of such power, as were practicable to secure such supremacy. And with equal distinctness do these texts set forth the fact that *character, condition, time, circumstances*, were intelligently taken into the account, with a view to the success in the efforts made. More still. They show that these personal powers were exercised independently of, and in direct opposition to, other personalities. There was not only a separate, but an antagonistic exercise of perception, judgment, volition. Were these constitutional elements of personality more clearly exemplified in the trial of Jesus by Pontius Pilate?

As establishing the same point, one more argument will be submitted. It is founded upon the relation which the Devil sustains to the Divine government. Respecting this relation, three things are unquestionable. One is, he is in a state of rebellion. Another is, he is in a state of punitive restriction. By this is meant, that, though he is not in such a condition of punishment as to prevent rebellious activity, he is subject to restraint in the execution of his insurrectionary purposes. The third is, within his allowed limits, he maintains a gov-

ernment of his own, in opposition to the government of God. If further proof is needed upon points made apparent in nearly every text relating to satanic agency, it will be found quite largely when another part of the subject is reached. What is here to be insisted upon, is the fact that his recognition as a subject of government proves his personality. His accountability, his capability of transgressing law, of persistent and organized rebellion, and of punishment, must sweep away all rational doubt.

And it is only necessary to add, that the same arguments are equally conclusive as applied to evil spirits generally. Accordingly, if what has been said has any force, the doctrine of personality must be accepted alike with regard to the "Devil and his angels."

If now the question proposed to Satan, as found in the first chapter of Job—"Whence comest thou"—should be raised respecting his origin, the answer furnished by some of our standard writers would be, that little or nothing can be known about it. Is this answer less mysterious than the subject to which it relates? Why assume such inevitable ignorance with an open Bible in our hands? True, the account of the origin of evil spirits is not as specific as is the account of the creation of man. Nor is it needful it should be. Some of our conclusions do rest upon *inferences*. But what of that? If legitimately drawn from well established data, are inferences not reliable? Exclude them altogether, and the creed of Christendom will be a very narrow one. Why suspicious of inferences? Are there any inherent difficulties involved suggestive of doubt? Are we more likely to draw unwarrantable conclusions from facts and first principles, than we are to misapprehend the meaning of the most positive statements? As commonly stated, upon what does the doctrine of a First Cause depend? Design is everywhere apparent, and we *infer* from it that there must have been a Designer. May not the same method of reasoning be applied to the origin of demons, especially if the premises are furnished by the Sacred Scriptures?

Accepting the fact of such spiritual entities, some things

at least respecting them are certain. One is, they are *created* beings; they are not *self-existent*. By common consent, self-existence can be predicated only of God.

Another proposition is, that in the ultimate sense, God is the only creative power in the universe. "Without Him was not any thing made that was made." Is it not, hence, just as certain that God created evil angels as it is that He created man? The creative domain is not limited by secondary causes. The last child that shall be born of Adam's race will be as truly a creature of God as was the great progenitor himself. Nor do the Scriptures permit us to suppose that any other intelligences derived their being from any other source.

Another proposition is, that as they came from His hand, like all His works, they were "very good." The effect must bear the impress of the cause. In the nature of things, it is no more possible for a Holy God to call into existence a race of rebellious beings, than it is to bring a "clean thing out of an unclean."

The conclusion accordingly must be, that the "Devil and his angels" are fallen beings. They were created upright, but, as moral beings, they apostatized by the abuse of their own powers. The *possibility* of such a result, is fully sustained by the nature of things. Only those are free who by their own choice may make themselves slaves. That such a possibility *may become* a sad reality, is more than exemplified by the sorrowful experience of the human race. As to the *fact*, the language of Scripture is unmistakable. Christ declares that the Devil "abode not in the truth," implying alike that he was created in it, and that he fell from it. And the record of Jude is equally clear and impressive. He speaks of "angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation." Such language can mean nothing but apostasy from an original state of rectitude.

Now, there are several questions of curious interest which precisely at this point are likely to press upon one's attention? At what date in the distant past, and for what reasons, were these evil spirits moved to "foul revolt?" Was it

simultaneous, or have there been rebellious uprisings at different epochs? Respecting all such inquiries, no satisfactory replies can be furnished. Nor are they needed. There must be a limit to our understanding, and in infinite wisdom God has placed the means of instruction within our reach, not so much for our gratification as for our good. In reality, we are not to be concerned about evil spirits, only as by their relations to us, we are liable to be injured by them. The knowledge we need is of a defensive character, and with a view to our entire safety, we may be thoroughly fitted and furnished from the Divine armory.

All that may be practical or profitable within the broad scope of the foregoing, and other like interrogatories, can perhaps be covered by a few general statements, such as the following:

There is no foundation for even conjecture respecting dates in the pre-Adamic period, during which the creation and apostacy of evil spirits must have occurred. We do know, and so much is all we should care to know, that Satan existed as a fallen being before the creation of man, and that it was by his agency that our first parents were led into disobedience.

The doctrine of a *plurality* of devils has an early recognition in the sacred records, and the allusions to it in the New Testament are so frequent and so emphatic as to leave no doubt that Christ and the Apostles intended to teach this doctrine. But there does not seem to be the slightest intimation of any classification with a view to anteriority.

For the supposition that different classes sustain different relations and cherish different dispositions with regard to the human race, there seems to be no foundation. All evil spirits are represented as relentless enemies, and are in no measure susceptible of virtuous restraints. Nor is there any warrant for the assumption, that the condition of any portion of them is such as to afford the slightest indemnity against their evil designs. The passage which speaks of some as held in "chains," does not necessarily imply absolute prohibi-

tion from evil. Practically and certainly, so far as mankind are concerned, it can mean nothing more than that those spoken of, like all others, are more or less under restraint.

By unquestionable implication, the Bible teaches that, as a whole, they are in a state of hopeless abandonment. They are beyond redemption. So far as we can see, no transforming or elevating means are in operation with regard to them. Nay, it is more than possible that the most effective reformatory influences, if used, would utterly fail to reach them. Whether they were at once consigned to this irremediable state as a consequence of their first disobedience, cannot be determined. Perhaps there is nothing in the word of God, nothing in the nature of things, to preclude the hypothesis that they may have incorrigibly passed through a period of probation, though, evidently, they are not in a state of probation. Perhaps all that can or should be said here is, that their doom has been fixed by Him who makes no mistakes. "The Judge of all the earth will do right." Excepting the probationary aspect, their present state is not dissimilar to that of impenitent human beings. It intermediates condemnation and execution. The sentence has been passed upon them, but for reasons which may wholly relate to others, it is held in suspension.

And here, perhaps more appropriately than elsewhere, we may meet the much mooted question respecting the *possible apostasy of holy beings*. It is true this dark problem is not peculiar to demonology. More effort has been expended to explain the origin of evil, as it affects the human race, than has been devoted to any other topic within the scope of theological research; and perhaps with less desirable results. And yet it cannot well be entirely ignored. The line between what may be known and the unknowable, should be, so far as it can be, drawn and recognized. The fall of angels and the fall of man are distinct, yet similar. Both were created upright. Both were moral beings. Both were moved by motives to violate law. Both, as a consequence, lost their rectitude, fell under condemnation, and underwent an appalling change in their nature and constitution. The known

point of dissimilarity is, that man was moved to disobedience by the presence and persuasion of a being already fallen. And this, doubtless, in his case is the key to the mystery. It is possible to conceive how even a holy being, wholly unguarded by experience, and free from all suspicions of danger, may be so assailed as to yield to temptation. For this, and for other reasons, this difficult subject may be more advantageously contemplated from the human than from the angelic standpoint. Whether or not the conquest of the human mind by the tempter, can be explained upon psychological principles, the relevancy of certain facts, as bearing upon the inquiry, will not be disputed. Man's nature, functionally, was sadly deranged by the fall; constitutionally, no fundamental changes were produced in it. In kind and number, his powers and passions remained as they were originally, though in their relative strength and operations they have become very otherwise. And yet, damaging as is the contrast, we have no better means for judging of the workings of an unfallen mind under the influence of temptation, than the careful cognizance of our own under circumstances more or less similar. But the gulf between the human and the angelic cannot thus be spanned. Nor are the teachings of the Scriptures as largely available in the one case as in the other. Hence, if the liabilities of original rectitude are to be explored, man's apostacy is doubtless the true starting point. But no such venture is now to be made.

Why, then, it may be asked, has the subject been broached? What has been or can be gained, if all that has been claimed is conceded? Just this, and nothing more: that the fall of man and the fall of angels must be accepted or rejected for reasons essentially the same. They must stand or fall together. There is not the difference of truth and falsehood between them. Admit what is common to both, and the peculiarities of either are capable of explanation.

It has already been seen that man was led into sin by the temptation of the Devil. It cannot be claimed that the fall of angels was occasioned by any such agency. If we suppose—and we have no authority for any such supposition—that

some apostate of longer standing, was the tempter in that case, the real difficulty is only carried further back, it is neither removed nor lessened. The difficulty is to understand how a holy being can be affected by sin so as to become sinful. This question occurs in the case of man. And if we answer it by pointing to the tempter, and, by supposition, in the same way, as we meet it again in the case of angels, we shall find occasion for an endless series of suppositions, which will bring us no nearer an explanation than we were when we started. Let us then at once concede that angels were not tempted by any previously fallen beings, as our first parents were. We are then prepared to inquire immediately, whether in the case of angels there was any fact which is as explanatory of their fall, as is the fact of the tempter explanatory of the fall of man. If there is such a fact, it must be sought in what is peculiar in their nature, or in their condition, or in both.

It has already been said that angels, like men, are *moral* beings. But it should be remembered that all moral beings are not essentially constituted alike. Angels are not men. And the difference between them as to their nature, *may* as clearly explain the apostacy of angels, as the fact of the tempter explains the apostacy of man. The case stands thus: they fell; they were not beguiled by any previously fallen being; accordingly, the motive must have originated within themselves. Man was moved from without. Angels must have been moved from within, as there was nothing without to move them. And could we as clearly apprehend wherein angels differ from men, as we apprehend the fact that Adam and Eve were tempted by the Devil, that difference might be as satisfactory in the one case as is the admitted fact in the other. It is true, we do *not* so clearly apprehend the distinctive characteristics of angels, as we do the fact that there was an evil being who tempted man. And yet that there is a difference between angels and men, is just as certainly a fact.

The point to be reached by the argument, let it be borne in mind, is *not* whether there ever was an apostacy of angels; but whether, accepting such apostacy, it is more diffi-

cult to harmonize it with reason, than is the doctrine of human apostacy. Nor is it claimed that the tempter in the one case, nor the dissimilarity of nature in the other, removes every source of doubt and difficulty. Only this is claimed: that for ought we know to the contrary, the difference in nature is just as satisfactory in the one case, as the tempter is in the other.

We may summarize thus:

As realities, angelic and human apostacies alike rest solely upon scriptural authority.

The only reason given for the fall of man, is the temptation of Satan. The only reason that can be conceived of for the fall of angels, is their difference from men.

The Scriptures do teach angelic apostacy, and they do teach that angels differ from men. Here then are two scriptural truths, the one the only reason that can be given for the other, and, so far as we can see, an all sufficient reason. So far, therefore, as reason reaches Scripture, we place the two apostacies side by side. If it is still objected, that the Bible connects the reason with the conclusion in the one case as it does not in the other, it will be answer enough to say, that one is presented directly and the other incidentally.

The conclusion now reached, that it is possible that temptation to evil may have its origin in an unfallen nature, and that thus angels were moved to rebel, it is believed will be materially strengthened by taking another scriptural truth into the account. We have insisted that there is a difference between angelic and human natures. It must now be added that in the scale of being, angels hold the higher rank. "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels." This not only shows a difference, but it shows also, to some extent, in what that difference consists. And as bearing upon the argument, a few points may be briefly noted.

Within certain limits, all human experience proves that elevation in rank endangers virtue. This is one point.

Another is, that, so far as we can know, subject to similar limitations, the same rule may apply to higher intelligences.

Still another is, that, from the nature of things, there must

be principles so fundamental as to necessarily have an application in common to all dependent and accountable creatures. And then we have only to suppose that the law of rank, as human experience is regulated by it, affects other intelligences similarly—and it would not be easy to name a law more fundamental—and we have at least a presumption which corroborates the position submitted. Of course, it will be urged, that holy and depraved beings are not necessarily affected in the same manner, and to the same extent, by the same laws. And of course this is admitted. And yet we must not overlook the humiliating truth, that the mass elevated virtue known on earth, even under the influence of grace, furnishes no exception to this rule.

The word *angel* has been repeatedly used to designate fallen beings. Sometimes, perhaps, improperly. It has been used thus as a matter of convenience, though under protest. It has, indeed, the sanction of Scripture. But, in some instances at least, *demons* are called *angels* in view of what they once were, rather than as expressive of what they now are. They once held the rank of *angels* in the proper sense of this word. To classify them as *angels* now, is to overlook a probable fact of great importance. It may be reasonably assumed that spiritual beings, unfallen and fallen, are alike progressive; and, accordingly, advancing in opposite directions, with a rapidity, perhaps, unknown to man, they must be separated by an immeasurable distance at the present time.

Scriptural intimations are suggestive of vast numbers. A writer of some note feels warranted in the "conjecture that they outnumber the human race." And the inquiry will force itself upon the mind, whether this vast multitude were all concerned in the first revolt, or whether by some means they have since received accessions. The question may be asked, but from whence is the answer to be derived? Is there any thing absurd, or even improbable, in the supposition, that the lost of our race, immediately after death, are mustered into the service of the "prince of this world," in his hostile assaults upon the kingdom of the Redeemer? Good angels are "all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for

them who shall be heirs of salvation." And that souls of departed saints are conducted by holy escorts as they ascend to the realms of light, and that they are welcomed to the associations and employments of the heavenly inhabitants, there can be no doubt. Is there less certainty that a converse experience awaits the wicked? The parallel between them and the righteous during the present life, and the corresponding alliances which the Bible teaches will exist in the life to come, establish at least a strong presumption, that the vast army of the great spiritual adversary is constantly increased from those on earth, who continue to be his vassals to the end of their probation.

So far as human nature is concerned, all error eventuates in distraction; and antagonistic elements enter essentially into the very essence of evil. Their forces, accordingly, are mutually repellant and tend to self-destruction. Hence the comparative weakness and the frequent failures of the allied powers of evil in their operations among men. Men disagree. Not so with fallen Spirits. "Devils with Devils damned firm concord hold." In their design there is unity; in their efforts, harmonious coöperation. Satan is never "divided against himself," nor in the many and diversified allusions scattered through the Scriptures can there be found a single intimation that "His angels" ever questioned his authority or became hostile to each other. On the contrary, from all that is said on this subject, the inference is inevitable that in the great conspiracy against God and all that is good, they are indissolubly bound together by a common aim and animated by a common purpose. To defeat the Divine plan respecting our race, as the grand end, and all the glorious means by which that end is to be attained, is not merely the *chief* object, but in reality the only object, to which their being and all their resources are devoted. Rebellion involves a forfeiture and a willful abandonment of the end of creature existence, while immortality necessitated the substitution of some other end consonant with the choice of the rebellious. Devils only live to disobey.

But to realize the full force of the unity of Apostate

Spirits in the accomplishment of their bad designs, another fact must be taken into the account. The hosts of hell are organized. They are under government. Within the impassible limits, fixed by God Himself, the ruling power of Evil is invested with a species of sovereignty. His supremacy as the "god of this world" is fully recognized, as is also the subserviency of the "rank and file" to the purposes of this vile compact. As pre-eminent in rank and authority, official titles, such as "the prince of this world," "the god of this world," "the prince of the power of the air," etc., are ascribed to the Devil. In exact correspondence with this, subordinate functionaries are denominated, "principalities," "powers," "rulers," while those subject to authority are called "devils," "angels," and other names which denote servility. Now, are these expressions meaningless? Did Christ and the Apostles use them merely to please the Jews, without intending to sanction the prevalent belief on this subject? Are they to be charged with a conservatism founded upon falsehood? Did they connive at a ruinous error, rather than provoke opposition? To ask such questions is to answer them. Martyrdom is not cowardice. Those who seal their testimony with their blood are not to be suspected of trifling with a system of truth which they hold dearer than life itself. The Scriptures do, accordingly, recognize as established among Apostate Spirits, rank, rule, authority, submission; in other words, government. They are organized with a view to a purpose. Their movements are regulated by law. Disloyalty is unknown among them. No separate or secondary interests or aspirations occasion discord. The love of life is lost in concentrating and unrelenting hatred and hostility to the doings and designs of God. All pride and power are subordinated to their fiendish plots. In the execution of these plots, no service is too menial, no sacrifice too great. The wisdom to plan, the courage to dare, the firmness to endure, are placed in unreserved consecration upon this infernal shrine. The end of their combinations is the ruin of the race; their highest delight the hopeless damnation of the immortal soul.

We come now to the inquiry, What is the extent of this "power of darkness?" What agencies does the Devil control? Of what forces is he master? To what extent may he prevail against God, against His cause, and against His creatures?

And here let no Manichæan notions find a place. The conclusions to which the Scriptures conduct us are, indeed, most startling. The titles mentioned are surely not meaningless. But yet the power of evil, in none of its modifications, can transcend divine permission. It is neither co-ordinate with the power of God, nor can it be exercised to any extent beyond His control. God's purposes cannot be defeated by it. The Devil and his angels can only do what God allows them to do. They have no guaranteed rights to tempt and torture, secure from Divine interference. Precedents only establish liabilities. The license granted in the case of Job, so far as we know, may never again be repeated. And yet it may be. Even such extremities may be permitted because they can be, as in that instance they were, overruled for good. And in the contemplation of every phase of this dark and dreadful subject, let it not for one moment be forgotten, that the end of all is God's glory, and that end is sure. He is over all, blessed for evermore. Hell not less than heaven is subject to His rule. What He permits, as well as what He appoints, answers to His ultimate designs. All error and all evil, however essentially at variance with the Divine nature and will, in the conclusive issue, will just as really and just as effectually, as truth and right, vindicate the honor of His name and the justice of His government. Devils, with relentless hate, seek to delay and to defeat God's gracious purposes towards our fallen race, while angels of light are employed in such ministrations of mercy as the economy of redemption may require. By means of both classes of agencies, shall the intelligent universe be brought to recognize the rectitude, the wisdom, the beneficence of God's eternal, universal, and finally undisputed supremacy.

There is yet another feature of this same far-reaching

truth, to which, briefly, in this connection, attention should be directed. Left to himself, man is not an inevitable slave to the Adversary. Except, perhaps, in a given condition, and in that only to a limited extent, Satan can have no absolute control over him. He cannot coerce his will, he cannot compel his vassalage. Man has the same ability to resist temptation to evil, that he has to yield to the motives of virtue. He is as responsible in the one case as in the other, and his responsibility rests upon the same foundation. He can "resist the Devil." Only as he is affected by physical forces under satanic control, does he become a helpless victim of his devices.

It remains for us to notice one of the most important questions relating to this subject. It is important because it is practical. It is comprehensive too, and hence as this is answered others must be. The question is this: *To what extent are the evils, to which our race is liable, traceable to Satan and his allies?* Is he the source whence *all* our evils come? If so, in what sense does he cause them? If not, to what other source can any portion of them be traced, and where is the line of distinction to be drawn?

To meet these inquiries fairly, a clear conception of what should be meant by *evils* must be secured. We use the plural because it evidently accords best with our habits of thinking. The usual classifications of *physical* and *moral* evils will be accepted. And it will be taken for granted that by physical evils is to be understood everything by which man, as a physical being, is subjected to inconveniences. Thus, the condition of the ground is such, as a consequence of the curse, that incessant toil is necessary to secure from it the means of subsistence. So, too, as occasioned by the fall, the human body is in a state which renders excruciating sufferings inevitable accompaniments of the propagation of the species. These are physical evils. So are diseases, however caused, as also all accidents. Nor is the death of the body, in this connection, to be overlooked. In a word, whatever interferes with, or in any measure embarrasses, the felicitous accomplishment of man's mission, as a physical being, is to be classed

among physical evils. By moral evils we mean sins of every sort, their proximate causes and legitimate consequences, as they bear upon our moral nature.

Now, to these two classes of evils the human family as a whole, always and everywhere, have been, and continue to be, subject. The only differences, have been differences of kind and degree. No generical evils have become extinct. In man's liabilities no material changes have occurred. To all the pains and privations, all the temptations and susceptibilities to which he ever was subject, he remains subject still. Constitutionally, and circumstantially, he is what he has been. Remedial agencies, to a greater or less extent, have diminished the power and restricted the scope of evil, so far as they have been effectively applied. But to-day, as heretofore, evil is predominant and universal. Now, *is this stupendous and complicated system of evil controlled by the "Devil and his angels?"*

An unqualified affirmative answer is, perhaps, hardly warranted by the common sentiment of Christendom. Distinctive sources of evil seem to be recognized. And yet, if a formulated statement of the faith of the Church upon this question is demanded, where shall it be found? Perhaps such a statement *should not* have a place in her creeds; but is it unreasonable to look for it in her literature? But, as it is *not* the object, in this paper, to depend for proof upon the history of the doctrine, it will not be needful to examine to what extent different authors have expressed themselves respecting it.

Let permission be granted to declare at once the position to be maintained, though, perchance, possible issue may be made with some for whose opinions profound respect is cherished.

Our proposition is, that *there is but one source of evil*; one "power of darkness;" one "father of lies;" one author of "all mischief;" one "spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience." "The god of this world" rules the entire realm of evil, subject to such limitations as have already been indicated. We have no knowledge of evil back of the apostacy

of angels. And in all its modifications and operations, it is, and must be, traced to the same source.

In the support of this conclusion, an appeal will first be made to the nature of things. The suggestions of reason respecting what is and must be true, are not to be ignored.

Evil—everything which antagonizes the well-being of rational intelligences—is the effects of sin. In the absence of sin the existence of evil is not supposable. God is not the author of sin, and consequently not the author of evil. Opposing elements do not enter into the Divine Essence, nor is the kingdom of heaven divided against itself. God is essentially good. Evil is essentially opposed to good. Accordingly, evil cannot proceed from God. To question either proposition is to question the eternal distinction between good and evil. Destroy this distinction and the difference between right and wrong ceases, and the foundation of accountability is subverted. Good and evil are necessarily antagonistic. The one cannot be the product of the other. Both cannot proceed from the same source. God cannot be the author of evil. It did not have its origin with man, as it existed before the creation. As a consequence, apostate spirits being the only class of evil intelligences of which we have any knowledge before the fall of man, and to whom the fall is directly ascribed, we can trace it no farther. Here our researches must end, and the presumption is that here evil had its origin.

Nothing is gained by taking exception in favor of physical evil at this point. The conclusions arrived at have no discriminating application. Physical evil is productive of creature suffering. This in itself is an evil. And it is just as inconsistent to suppose that suffering is a product of infinite goodness, as it is to suppose that sin proceeds from infinite purity. In the ultimate result, is it not precisely as absurd to assume that God destroys the harvest by a hail storm, desolates the town by a tornado, or swallows up the city by an earthquake, as it is to assume that He creates the appetite of the inebriate, the lust of the libertine, the motive of the murderer? The cases, of course, are very different in them-

selves considered, and very different in their bearings upon man. But how is the one more than the other to be reconciled with the idea of infinite goodness as its source? In a sinless state, can the one exist any more than the other? A negative to this question is a concession that physical and moral evil sustain the same relation to sin as their cause.

But does not God accept evil as an element of his own economy, and so regulate it as to subserve His own purposes? Such an assumption may be true or false, according to the construction which is put upon it. If by it is meant, that God has accommodated His government to rebellion, and that He regards obedience and disobedience with indistinguishable complacency or connivance, it amounts to logical nonsense and religious blasphemy. But if by it is meant that God so overrules and disposes of all evil as to promote the interests of His own kingdom and the welfare of His loyal subjects, the powers of evil to the contrary notwithstanding, of course it is true. This is just what we claim. But does this relieve Satan as the source of evil? Does it make God the author? And so God permits what He does not approve. He overrules what He does not appoint. He makes such disposition of evil as to defeat its own tendencies. And He does this just as certainly and just as effectually respecting moral evil, as He does respecting physical evil. "All things work together for good."

Of course, it will be said, that what have been designated as physical evils, are effects of natural causes, that they are governed by fixed laws, and that satanic agency has no more control over them than it has over the rising and the setting of the Sun, or the changing of the seasons. It has, indeed, been asserted again and again, that the material world is not affected by the moral constitution of the race; that fires and floods, that miasmatic climates and consequent epidemics, "the pestilence that walketh in darkness," and "the destruction that wasteth at noon day," if sin had not entered, would as certainly, and to the same extent, have swept over the world as now.

Now, all that really need be said in reply, is, that this

is the merest assumption, associated with the sheerest absurdity. One hardly knows whether to treat it with silence or contempt. Who has shown, or who can show, that physical causes are free from satanical interference? And how simply preposterous the assumption that there is no reciprocal power between the moral and the material world! Is not the state of the country affected by the character of the people? Are mind and morals less subject to law than matter is? Has God less to do with moral than with physical laws? Is it not just as reasonable to suppose that God may permit the forces of nature to overleap their bounds, as in the case of the flood, for the punishment of an abandoned people, as it is to suppose that He may permit a people to become abandoned, a supposition which everybody knows involves a terrible reality?

But all that may be claimed respecting natural causes, may be conceded without damage to the point to be sustained,—that those causes within certain limits, by Divine permission, are under the control of satanic agency. Let us admit, if the demand is made, that, had not sin found way into our world, the fixed laws which now control it, would have made it subject to all the dire reverses which it now endures; that storms would have swept its surface; deadly vapors loaded its atmosphere, and the pent-up heavens refused to relieve its parched acres: what then? Does it follow that sinless man would have been, as now he is, the victim of them all? The simoon of the desert, where there is no life, is not an evil, whatever may be its fury; nor, were life there, would it be, if protected from its destructive power. Evil consists in injury to intelligent beings. Shield humanity; then let subterranean fires burst forth and wrap the earth in flames, no evil will ensue. There can be no evil where there is no sin. Hence, it matters not, so far as the argument is concerned, whether the elements became armed with evil by sin, or whether they were invested with all their present power before the fall, and man became exposed to their fury, when he parted with the shield of his innocence.

It would not be difficult, we think, to derive a strong pre-

sumptive argument in favor of the doctrine, that Satan, is the sole source of evil, from the history of the moral condition of the race. Since the fall, man has been in rebellion against the Divine government. Sin has been universally and unceasingly prevalent. Here is one conclusion to which we are conducted by this history. Another is, that from the first, there has been in active operation a combination of antagonizing forces sufficient to overcome this rebellion, if man alone had been concerned in it. Some powerful elements of our nature have never been fully overcome by evil. Conscience has always protested against disloyalty. So have our fears. And in the darkest depravity, we have never lost sight of the distinction between right and wrong, nor of the connection between cause and effect. Another fact is, that some of the most prevalent and most ruinous sins of the race find little direct support in our nature, depraved as it is. They are unnatural and are propagated and sustained mainly by habit and education. Every body sees the difference between idolatry and licentiousness. And since the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, the remedial system has been more or less effectively in operation. Light has been increasing. The benefits resulting from virtue have been made more and more apparent and attractive. And so too the consequences of disobedience have been rendered more and more distinctive and appalling. God has not left the race to itself. At "sundry times and in diverse manners" He has caused His voice to be heard and His claims to be felt. Means of instruction, encouragement, rebuke, correction, in endless variety, have been used with a view to moral improvement. And the proposition to be submitted is that, depraved as our nature is, but for the perverting, distracting and opposing powers of darkness, the human family would have attained to a much more exalted state of excellence than can now be claimed in its behalf. The suggestion therefore is, that during every stage of our history, a combination of powerful agencies has been encountered, the design of which has been to perpetuate and intensify man's rebellious disposition towards his Maker. All God's dealings

with him have tended to his restoration. Some of the most effective forces of his own nature have been co-operative with the Divine purposes. It seems impossible, accordingly, to rationally account for the present moral condition of mankind, only as the scriptural explanation is accepted.

But we cannot fully traverse this fruitful field of research. It is not needful we should. This brief allusion to it has been made that it may be properly associated with the scripture view, which is now more particularly to claim attention. Reason never supersedes, but always harmonizes with, revelation. Neither is to be ignored.

The exact question respecting which we are now to consult, "the law and the testimony," is whether all evil is traceable to the same source; whether through all proximate causes and intermediate agencies, the connection between the entire system and the "god of this world" can be established.

In replying to this inquiry our first position is, that *the Word of God, without any discrimination, recognizes Satan as the source of evil.*

There are several classes of texts which bear upon this point, some of each of which will be examined.

"The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil." Matt. 13 : 38, 39.

Only three things here need be noticed :

The scope of the parable; "the field is the world." The condition of the entire race is represented. Such world-wide expressions admit of no restrictive applications.

The contrast of character and designation of the preponderating class. "The good seed—the children of the kingdom" can mean only those who have been translated from the power of darkness." "The tares—the children of the wicked one," of course include all not embraced in the other class. All who are not saints are sinners. All saints have been sinners. All, accordingly, have been "the children of the wicked one."

The relation of the Devil to the tares. They are *his chil-*

dren, he sowed them. In other words, he originated and controlled the evil of their nature.

The passage in John, 8 : 44, "Ye are of your father the Devil," etc., is so exactly parallel with this, so far as concerns this point, that it requires no separate notice. Both teach, without any qualification, that Satan propagates and disseminates all evil all through the race.

A very significant passage of similar import, is found in Rev. 12 : 9. Without even a metaphorical intervention, it is directly asserted, that the "old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan—deceiveth the whole world." Universal deception is universal evil, and must, accordingly, involve every conceivable form of evil.

Another class of texts teach that to overcome evil, we must overcome the Devil. In other words, that the power of evil is controlled by the Devil. Only two passages will be quoted.

"Or else, how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man." Matt. 12 : 29.

"That they may recover themselves out of the snare of the Devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." 2 Tim. 2 : 26.

However these passages may be construed, they inevitably conduct us to two conclusions: one is, that man is in bondage to the Devil: the other is, that to escape from this bondage, the power of the Devil must be broken.

There is yet another class of texts, to only one of which attention will be called.

"And the Devil taketh Him up into a high mountain," etc. Luke 4 : 5, 6.

Interpret this fearful passage as we may, there is no escape from the following conclusions:

Christ was not exposed to the power of the Devil to a greater extent than mere human beings are.

The Devil claimed the power over "the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them."

Christ made no issue respecting this claim. He met the
Vol. VIII. No. 4

temptation. He repelled the offer. But neither by expression nor implication, did He question the right or the power of the devil to make or fulfill the proposal. Only in regard to the conditions made, did He resent the offer. And who will raise the question whether, had Christ recognized satanic supremacy, He might not have realized all that was promised, in the sense in which that promise is to be understood?

Combining these several classes of passages, and each class is somewhat numerous, and, without doubt, they fully justify the general proposition, that the power of the Devil over evil is unqualifiedly recognized by the Scriptures.

We now take another position. *The Word of God does not recognize any other source of evil.* This demands little more than a distinct statement. In effect it has already been insisted upon. We have seen that God is not the source of evil. We have seen too that man is not. Evil existed before man was created. It may, however, here be added, that evil, as endured, practiced and propagated by man, is traceable to "the Spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience." It can scarcely be necessary to insist that such expressions as represent God as the author of evil, the most remarkable of which is perhaps found in Isaiah—"I make peace, and create evil"—must be understood in the sense either of permission or of punishment.

A third general position remains to be stated. Of all others, it is the most comprehensive, and, in some respects, it is the most important. It is this:

The Bible recognizes the power of the Devil over all the agencies, instrumentalities, and influences which are called in requisition in the maintenance, propagation, and infliction of evil upon mankind.

We shall need to be on our guard against confusion of thought. Unnecessary distinctions will accordingly be avoided. Our object will not require us to examine direct and indirect operations separately. Nor will it be worth while to discriminate between the doings of the "Devil and his angels." But every argument must be fairly subjected to two inquiries; one is whether the means to be considered tend to

evil, the other is whether they are under the control of fallen spirits.

The human mind is susceptible of influence. Other beings bring a power to bear upon us which causes us to think, and act, and feel as we would not, were we left to ourselves. Influence, from whatever source, of whatever character, though capable of many modifications, must operate with more or less uniformity. In this, as in other things, like causes, under like circumstances, produce like effects. There must be adaptation with a view to given results. The motive must be suited to the mind. Temptation presupposes that the tempter understands the person to be assailed. And this accords with the teaching of God's word. Everywhere it assumes that evil spirits have an extensive and accurate knowledge of human nature. They are master of its capabilities, of the laws which govern it, and of the means by which it can be moved in given directions. They have the power, and know how to exercise it, to suggest thought; to excite feeling; to influence passion; to stimulate imagination; to engender skepticism; to disarm fear; to beget recklessness; to create attachment to evil and aversion to all that is good: in a word, to dispose and direct the tempted so as to fascinate them with some form of evil, and to fortify them against all protective influences. And such is the multiplicity of their numbers, the unity of their designs, the celerity of their movements, the versatility of their natures, that, having such access to the mind, they seem to have a sort of general guarantee of success in the facilities which they possess. That they are capable of assuming different characters, and of becoming visible or invisible at will, there can be little doubt. Operating simultaneously upon different minds, in different places, by different means, so as to secure at the same time extension and concentration of their influence, they possess themselves of a species of potential ubiquity. A given condition of things which, in different persons under gracious influence, will excite pity, forbearance, magnanimity; in different persons, under the power of evil, may awaken prejudice, enmity, malevolence. And thus Satan

transforms love into lust, prudence into avarice, economy into meanness, and commendable aspiration into vaulting ambition.

And the power thus exercised is immeasurably augmented by the control which evil spirits evidently have over material things, and the relation which mind sustains to them. They affect, and, to a greater or less extent, regulate the senses as well as the mental and moral faculties. As turned to the objects of temptation, sight suggests and stimulates; sound ravishes and enchains; taste intoxicates; touch infatuates. Facts and tangible objects are so distorted, thrown into such relations to each other, and contemplated only from such points of observation as make them suggestive of the most pernicious conclusions. Indeed, temptation is deception, and deception is falsehood. Accordingly, the Scriptures, with awful significance, represent the Devil as a liar and the father of lies.

Now, it is believed, that this representation in no respect either misrepresents or transcends the Bible view of this subject. Thus our first parents were tempted. Thus our Saviour was assailed. Thus Satan by his devices gets the advantage of men in our day. Thus "the Spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience" begets in them "all manner of concupiscence." And thus it will be seen that all our mental, moral, and physical endowments, all the incoming and outflowing forces of our nature, all our surroundings and relations, are within the scope of the "power of darkness."

From what has now been said, it must be apparent that, to the extent that men become the vassals of the Devil, their activities and their influence must harmonize with his hellish designs. They become devilish in the Devil's service. Hence wicked men, whether in the body or out of it, both before and after death, constitute a part of the "power of darkness."

There seems to be more difficulty and more doubt in most minds respecting Satanic control over the physical world, than in regard to any other part of the subject. The fact that, within certain limits, he exercises such control, is not a question. And it will lessen our perplexities to constantly

keep in mind that evil can never transcend Divine permission. Evil Spirits absolutely can do nothing except what God allows them to do. But He does permit Satan to assume and wield a sort of sovereignty, both in the moral and in the physical world. Satan does, to some extent, control the laws of mind and of matter. And, evidently, it is just as consistent with the Divine economy, that he should be permitted to exercise his power in the one department as in the other. Why should he not as well control the wind as to control thought? Why not as well fill the air with malaria, as infuse impurity into the soul? Who will determine why the one is not just as conceivable and just as reasonable as the other? Who will tell us why it is not as conceivable and as reasonable, that the great Adversary should be allowed to wield all the power ascribed to him in the Scriptures, as that he should be allowed to wield any power? We do know that there is a connection between mind and matter, and that mind has some control over matter. We do know that there is a *nexus* between man's soul and body, and that his soul largely moves and regulates his body. What this connection is, or by what process the one affects the other, we do not know, nor can we know. Now, in the case of Job, Satan controlled not only the Sabeans and the Chaldeans, but the wind, and the fire, and the different types and degrees of the diseases with which the man of Uz was smitten, as well. Is it any more difficult to harmonize the tremendous license which was granted to Satan, with God's character and economy, than it is to account for the liberty which is allowed to wicked men, to corrupt, defraud, and destroy each other, so that this liberty will not be found in conflict with the idea of infinite goodness? The simple truth is, and it accords with the facts of experience and the teachings of Scripture, that evil spirits have their sphere, beyond which, except by special permission, they are not allowed to extend their operations. This accords exactly too, with our conception of an established order of things. It is in correspondence with the Divine government over human beings. There are fixed

boundaries beyond which wicked men may not extend their influence.

After all, what is evil, but good abused and perverted? The laws of matter and of mind, as God established them, were all very good and tended only to good. Satan perverts, and, as instigated by him, man abuses these laws, and here the evil lies. The facts are alarmingly apparent; the ultimate reasons who will explain! Evil is a dreadful reality. The moral and the physical are both affected by it. Only God can fix limits to it in either. But why not at once accept, without cavil or equivocation, the terrible truth, so impressively set forth in the experience of Job, and so clearly sustained in every part of the sacred volume? By flames and storms, by fraud and violence, by disease and death, Satan robbed Job of his property, bereaved him of his children, took possession of and turned against him the wife of his bosom, brought upon him the most intolerable diseases, and but for specific prohibition, would have taken his life. Similar calamities are met now; what right have we to say they come from any other source? Do we lessen the number or lighten the load, by dividing them up between God and the Devil? Can such a division be made without compromising infinite goodness, and under-estimating the strength of infernal malignity? In language too memorable to be overlooked, too clear to be misapprehended, Christ declared that the woman, whom He relieved on the Sabbath day, had been "bound by Satan, lo, these eighteen years." In numerous other instances He charged the Devil as the cause of sickness and of suffering. And with equal clearness, without any qualification, the Apostle places "the power of death" in the hands of the Devil. Should any claim, that this and other like texts must be interpreted subject to implied limitations, we press the question, *why*; we ask for proof: we demand that the line of demarcation be drawn. There is here but one line to be recognized, and that is the line between good and evil. This is established in the nature of things, and Divine authority never permits it to be overlooked. On the one side we see the works of God, on the other the works of

the Devil. God means to make His creatures understand that hell will do its worst. And He means to make us understand, too, that such is the "power of darkness," that our only hope against it must rest in the "Son of God," who "was manifested that He might destroy the works of the Devil."

But there still seems to be a source of shadow. The mind shrinks from the conclusion that satanic agency is so closely associated with all sorts of human sufferings. We want to see the hand of God in them. All are disciplinary. All indicate a Father's love. "Whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth." If Satan causes them, how is it that God's blessings accompany them? May not the rod be in the hand of the enemy, and the blow be regulated by Him who has absolute control of the enemy? We must distinguish between the motive of the agent and the design of the ruler. We have no reason to complain of or fear the prevalence and power of malevolence, so long as all its operations are governed by infinite goodness. Only let Joseph, and Job, and Cyrus be remembered. And if we must still insist that these are extraordinary instances, we have only to bear in mind, that God regulates the raging tempest as well as the gentle breeze.

The moral purposes subserved by the universality, perpetuity, and terrible efficiency of the power of darkness, existing by Divine permission, is another vast field of inquiry to which this subject directs attention. But, as has already been intimated, it may be more advantageously contemplated from another point of observation. And yet completeness requires that a few points should be briefly noted.

The human mind can not be enslaved without its own consent. Those only are in bondage to the Devil who choose to be. As we are situated and affected by sin, our vassalage is a preparation for our freedom. "God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin."

We always meet the Devil in the presence of God. With His eye on us and His hand on him, satanic power will only subserve the Divine purposes.

Christ encountered and defeated the power of darkness.

The fearful shafts of the enemy fell harmless at His feet. He fully demonstrated the practicability of resisting temptation. The sovereignty of Satan was effectually disputed and his prestige was destroyed. The possibility of invulnerable virtue was exemplified. The trial of the "second Adam" ended in triumph. In Him we are "more than conquerors." The captain of our salvation is able to succor all who are tempted.

The toleration of evil spirits in their ceaseless assaults upon God's gracious economy, is further explained by the fact, that our race is developed and disciplined as otherwise it could not be, by the vigilance and struggles thus rendered inevitable. Man rises to excellence about in proportion as his god-like qualifications are legitimately brought in requisition. And nothing so deeply and decidedly stirs and calls forth his energies as opposition; nothing so invincibly sustains his courage, as the assurance of conquest. In this contest a powerful appeal is made to these susceptibilities of our nature. As we "wrestle against principalities and powers," we are driven by necessity to make use of the "whole armor of God." We fight, "not as one who beats the air." And we are sure of victory. Hell's dread empire is to be overthrown. "All rule, and all authority and power," are to be put under the Redeemer's feet. Death, the last dread ally of the Devil, shall be destroyed. Then shall the end come. The great rebellion will cease. The kingdom will be delivered up to God, even the Father, and He will be "all in all." The Devil and his angels, and all of our race allied with them, shall be doomed to merited punishment.

Thus the arch-conspirator against the government of God, with all the forces he could enlist from heaven, earth, and hell, with power and privilege, time and opportunity granted, which, to short-sighted mortals have seemed to imply either Divine connivance or surrender, is doomed to complete and final failure.

What then? From this awful struggle, what will have been gained? Out of so much evil, how much good?

The rightful supremacy of Jehovah will be maintained. Uncompromising justice will be vindicated. The hopeless-

ness and dire consequences of rebellion will be exemplified. The loyalty of the intelligent universe will be eternally secured.

A brief statement of the practical bearings of the view, which has now been submitted, upon the Demonology of the New Testament, will close the article.

The cases in which persons are said to have been possessed with devils, are perhaps no more mysterious than many diseases from which, in some respects, they are not distinguishable. All sufferings are the effects of sin. If man were not a fallen being, he would be no more liable to fever than to lunacy. In the days of Christ he was, and now is, exposed to both, as the victim of the power of evil. He is drawn into enervating excesses, or is driven to encounters with hostile elements, by which he is overcome, and thus, either by his weakness or by his wickedness, he falls a prey to the deadly influence. He is tempted, ensnared, overcome. And he is possessed by the Devil, just in proportion as the disease of his body, or the derangement of his mind, becomes uncontrollable. The only real difference between the possessed of Gadara and the paralytic of Capernaum, was a difference of form and degree. And such differences are seen now. Who needs to be told that all the modifications and extremities of helplessness and frenzy recorded of the wretched sufferers of those times, are fully exemplified at the present day. A visit to the insane asylum, will enable any one to witness all the manifestations of human nature under the power of evil, which were seen among the masses of the afflicted, which crowded the pathway of our Saviour for relief, while He was upon the earth. And these terrible assaults are just as much the work of the Devil now as they were then. Nor is the seemingly absurd idea of several evil spirits taking possession of the same person at the same time, either inexplicable or irrational. It surely is not an uncommon occurrence for a person to become the victim of a complication of diseases, all, perhaps, superinduced by some indiscretion of his own, and resulting, it may be, in disclosures as dreadful and as hu-

miliating as were those of the demoniacs of the New Testament.

The doctrine of the real existence, personality and combined activity of evil spirits, is not to be trifled with. It is not to be ignored. The pulpit is not to be ridiculed into silence respecting it. As a doctrine of revelation and of experience, it should be studied that it may be understood. Our dangers, not less than our advantages, demand attention. If we would not be deceived and led captive by the Devil at his will, we must not be "ignorant of his devices."

ARTICLE VI.

THE FULNESS OF CHRIST.

By REV. VAN ALSTINE, Raymertown, N. Y.

This subject invites thorough investigation. It will tax all the powers of mind and heart, to understand and wisely discriminate between truth and error. It is no disparagement of the mental faculties, nor a mystification of the subject, to say, that we are inadequate to the task, and that it transcends a full analysis; yet we should not feel confounded or disheartened, and retire from the effort to study and to unfold it. Assuredly we shall find valuable truths and thought, which will well repay for the time and effort bestowed. It will not be in vain, if we give only an outline of the doctrine, with a few phases of thought.

If this subject is anywhere ably expounded, we shall find it in the Epistles of the apostle Paul. He looks at the doctrine from this standpoint: *It pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell.*" This Paul regarded as a simple fact, full and comprehensive. As such we must receive it and rejoice in it, for Christ is our all in all. Paul was fully persuaded, that all Christians, by their experience of redemption, its fulness, power, and glory, would be better qualified to understand and appreciate the glory and fulness of the Person of Christ. He had an intense anxiety, that all

who begin a religious life, should quickly graduate the life of a novice, and become mature Christians, ripe and perfect; to be filled with the knowledge of Christ, be worthy of their high calling, be well-pleasing in the sight of God, be vigorous by His effective energy, be full of long-suffering and patience with a joyful heart, and thus be spiritually qualified for the inheritance of the saints of light; for then they would have no doubt of their translation from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of grace, and in due time into future glory.

To effect such a blessed work in the hearts of all believers, to bring them into a state of spiritual refinement and joy, such ripeness of religious experience and perfection, Christ in His fulness is adequate. Not only in the dignity of His person, but also in the fulness of His attributes, sovereign grace, wonder-working power and glory, He stands as the head of the universe, the chief of all things in the earth and in heaven; both the material and spiritual worlds are dependant upon His upholding and governing hand; His royal sceptre is over all and should be obeyed.

1. Christ in His fulness is chief of the physical world. In the fulness of the Son of God was born the ideal conception of the world. He was fully adequate for this stupendous work, though it required a Divine Being, infinite in all His attributes, to create a world. We are assured, that by Christ all things were made; nothing began to exist without Him, and that He upholds all things by His power. He is unoriginated, filling infinite space, conscious of a perfect conception of Himself and a complete survey of the ideal universe in all its heights and depths, mysteries, laws, and results.

He was the God of Eternity, Omnipresent; with Him the past and the future are blended into the present. Such is God, and such is the Son of God, infinite in all His perfections, the Creator of the world both material and spiritual, all to redound to His praise and glory. What else is consistent with the bold and lofty conception of the inspired apostle, when he says, "that in Christ all fulness dwelt?" Though in Him was the Godhead, yet he became incarnate,

He moved and dwelt among men, full of grace and truth. And as soon as the broad and infinite conception of this Being, a conception inexpressibly grand as a whole and in all its parts, complete in order and perfection was embodied, there rolled out of His plastic hand a world-reality. What else should we see in this creative act but an unquestionable evidence of the fulness of the Son of God?

Christ, therefore, possessed the perfections of God. If He possessed one infinite attribute, then all; if not all, then none. He possessed all, not by delegation, but by an unoriginated right; for if by delegation, then the Being who once was God would cease to be God, and He who once was not God, would thus become God. What else is this but a logical absurdity? Christ had the attribute of eternity, He was therefore the first and the last, the Alpha and Omega. "The same was in the beginning with God." (Jno. 1: 2.) "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory I had with thee before the world was." (Jno. 17: 5.) "And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, fear not, I am the first and the last: I am He that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore; Amen; I have the keys of hell and of death." (Rev. 1: 17) "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." (Rev. 22: 13.) We are authorized to believe, that Christ existed in eternity, was before all time and the period of creation, possessed co-equally the ineffable glory of the Father, the First and the Last, God over all, blessed for evermore. Such a Being certainly possessed the fulness of the Godhead, therefore must be God.

If possessed of the attribute of eternity, he must of necessity possess every infinite perfection. He was infinite in power, illimitable in presence, infinite in knowledge, wisdom, goodness and holiness, unchangeable in His nature and purposes. "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever." (Heb. 13: 8.) Christ being infinite, there can be no increase of His perfection, nor decrease. What He was before creation, He will continue to be for ever; the same in

perfection, fulness and glory. Creation only made manifest His power, wisdom and goodness, and did not constitute Him God. "He was in the world and the world was made by Him." (Jno. 1 : 16.) "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hand. They shall perish, but Thou remainest." (Heb. 1 : 10, 11.) The world was made by Him; He also governs and upholds it for His ultimate glory.

To create the world, this stupendous and complicated structure, required nothing less than infinite wisdom and power, and nothing less to regulate the same, to guide and govern its motion and secure its original design. For this reason the Bible teaches us that all things were made for Christ, and that He upholds all things. All things were committed into His hand, whether things on earth, or in heaven, for in Him all fulness dwells. Paul says, "For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him and for Him: and He is before all things and by Him all things consist." (Col. 1 : 16, 17). "Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power." (Heb. 1 : 3). Christ is the head of the material universe. He was before any created thing had any existence, therefore the cause of all things, for by Him, and for Him as the end, the world was made, and on Him it depends for support and perpetuation. This doctrine, taught by the apostle, is conclusive, and cannot fail to prove the fulness of Christ, and that He is the chief of the material and spiritual world—the whole universe in its totality. What a great and adorable being Christ is, was, and shall forever be. How consistent the command, "Let all the angels of God worship Him."

The prerogative to create, uphold, guide, and govern all things, visible and invisible, is not the only one with which He is invested, clearly manifesting His Godhead; but He also possesses the prerogative, and He is the only being who absolutely possesses it, to forgive and save from sin. To for-

give sin indicates His fulness, for who besides God can do this difficult and wonderful work? The Jews believed that God alone could forgive sin, therefore they charged Christ with the crime of blasphemy, when He said to a man sick and palsied, "Thy sins are forgiven thee." When the people brought a man unto Christ, afflicted with the palsy, to be healed, and He witnessed the strength and purity of their faith, He said to the man "Take up thy bed and walk." The man was thoroughly healed and went his way rejoicing. Christ, as the Son of God, gave positive proof that He had, and could exercise, this prerogative, therefore He was the true God. Peter also affirmed this doctrine, and Christ's exaltation was a full confirmation. "Him hath God exalted with His right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." (Acts 5 : 31). The prerogative to forgive sin is proof that the being who is invested with it, is the chief executive of the universe, above all law in the moral government, and that He has the unqualified right to pardon and reprove without injustice or dishonor to God. No one beside the Moral Ruler can reprove, if therefore Christ exercised this prerogative, it is evident, that in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead.

The fulness of Christ was also manifest in His power to raise the dead. The author of life in creation, can reorganize and give life to the dead. He who made the delicate structure of the ear and eye, can cause the ears and eyes of the dead to hear and see, at the blast of the archangel's trumpet, and restore natural life to bodies long ago dissolved in their graves. This divine power Christ rightly declared He possessed and could exercise whenever disposed so to do. With Him the resurrection-power and life were always present, for it was His indisputable prerogative to raise the dead. He said, "I am the resurrection and the life"—"all who believe in me shall live"—"because I live, they shall live also."

Christ taught His disciples and the human race, that He stood on a *perfect equality* with the Father, not only in works and honor, but also in divine attributes—in unoriginated prerogatives. "For as the Father raiseth the dead and quicken-

eth them ; even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." (Jno. 5 : 21). "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. 3 : 21). This prerogative of Christ was a conclusive evidence that He was the true Messiah and no deceiver, that all the doctrines He taught were the essential truths of Christianity ; positive proof of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and of eternal life in reservation for the saints of God. The apostles, on almost every occasion, preached the resurrection of Christ as proof of the divinity of His teachings, and in confirmation of the doctrines they proclaimed, to console and inspire the people of God with hope of final salvation from all their afflictions and bereavements, and even in the last dark hour, when treading the crumbling margin of the grave. We are thus fully assured that life and death are subject to the power of Christ ; not only is He able to rejuvenate the face of nature with life, bloom and beauty, but also to renew and transform the moral world unto the likeness of God, to fit all hearts to abide with Him in His glory.

The fulness of Christ is seen in His right to judge the world. All judgment is vested in Him as the God-man ; as the incarnate God. To execute this work wisely, impartially, and decisively, He must be possessed of omniscience ; all things must lie naked and open to His eye ; His dominion be co-extensive with the broad universe ; His power and authority must be equal to the task of summoning all intelligences before His judgment-seat, to correctly investigate moral character and determine the destiny of our race. It is said, He will judge the living and dead ; all will appear before His tribunal to give account of all the deeds done in the body, whether good or bad. Who then shall present themselves before the Judge to take exceptions to the rules, the right and the qualification of Christ to sit in judgment on all the earth ? Shall the holy angels, who are God's agents of mercy and wrath, who behold His glory with enraptured gaze, or acquiesce in the lowering clouds of His fierce indignation ?

Shall the saints, redeemed, crowned, and glorified, and who have been adjudged worthy to abide in the beauties of holiness and enjoy eternal life? Shall the sinful, debased and polluted, who are now banished forever from grace and heaven, lift up their voice in reproach and blasphemy against Christ, the Judge, for His righteous decision and for their fearful destiny? Instead of this, they will cry out and say, just and righteous art Thou, Thou King of saints, in all Thy ways, because Thou hast judged thus. Christ alone is qualified and is fully invested with the right and authority to judge the world as the Son of Man; all judgments are committed into His hand, of which we have proof by His resurrection from the dead.

The fulness of Christ is indicated by the fact, that in dignity He stands in *comparison* with the Father. Christ, in addressing the Father, says: "I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work thou gavest me to do." (Jno. 17 : 4). It is required of all worshipers to honor the Son as they honor the Father; to fail in such worship, is not only a dishonor of Christ, but also will neutralize all true worship of the Father. Christ is not less entitled to all heartfelt and supreme worship than the Father. Both have an equal claim to the supreme worship of all intelligent beings, as both are equal in nature, power, and glory. The inspired word says, "How God also anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed of the devil; for God was with Him." (Acts 10 : 38). No distinction is made between Christ and the Father in the attributes of knowledge and wisdom. "I know that His commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." (Jno. 12 : 50). We see the same evidence in the attribute of goodness. No being is absolutely and superlatively good, except God, yet Christ feels it no unjust assumption to claim supreme goodness, for He said to a certain young man, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." (Matt. 19 : 17). The fact

that goodness was attributed to Him, and then in the realm of truth there is none good but God, and yet we hear no protest from the lips of Christ that He was not entitled to such exalted distinction, is a clear proof that He was supremely good, and therefore God. Yet it is undeniable, that Christ was imbued with the feelings and sympathy of a fellow man, that while He dwelt among men, He was hated and despised, endured poverty and pain, was crucified, and died on the cross; yet we look upon Him, His whole life-work, with amazement, and see in Him the manifestations of the fulness of God.

In view of the fact, that in Him was seen every divine perfection, that in Him was invested all authority in heaven and earth, wielding the sceptre of universal dominion, and all worlds moving in obedience to His will, it is beyond doubtful disputation, that He is the chief ruler of the universe, and that in Him all fulness of the Godhead dwells.

2. The fulness of Christ is revealed in His relation to the moral and spiritual world. From this standpoint the inspired apostle contemplates Christ as the all-sufficient and glorious Saviour, with a more cheerful heart and hopeful anticipations, for in this relation and work shine forth greater benevolence and beauty. In his clear and comprehensive conception of the nature, mission, and character of Christ, he believes Him to be abundantly able to devise and execute a perfect and successful plan of redemption. While to all inexperienced and finite beings, the problem of the salvation of the guilty, seemed impracticable, and in stern conflict with justice and moral law, yet, to the enlightened mind of Paul, in view of the fulness of Christ, the mystery was solved, and the fact of the salvation of believers was fully established. While it was indisputable that sin was a gross outrage in the government of God, that all moral law was immutable, that all the guilty must be punished, for moral law had no provision of mercy and pardon, yet he saw in Jesus' pierced side an outflowing stream of blood to wash away sin. In Christ, therefore, the honor and supremacy of law could be main-

tained, and the repenting sinner be saved. To do this gracious work, no one could devise a plan of redemption but God, and no one execute it but Christ. Such a system of mercy, rich in grace, and infinite in wisdom, we behold in practical operation and crystalizing into a substantial fact, in defiance of unbelief, philosophy and vaunting reason.

We will not turn aside, in this discussion, to assail the batteries of the enemies of inspired truth and the cross of Christ. We feel entirely satisfied and contented with the doctrines of the Fulness of Christ, and salvation by grace, as taught by Paul and the other apostles. Paul declares with triumphant exultation, "The righteousness of God without the law was manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time His righteousness; that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." (Rom. 3: 21—26). Assuming the position, that Paul was divinely authorized to speak on this subject, and what he says was inspired, then the conclusion is undeniable, that God's plan of salvation is in accord with His honor, justice and law, that it will prove gloriously successful in its operations and final results. Christ can save the repenting and believing sinner. He can purify the polluted heart, remodel the ruined character, and restore the sin-stained soul to His own righteousness and true holiness. All who become the trophies of grace are created anew in Christ Jesus, and are conformed to His unstained image. In this redemptive scheme, Christ is perfectly able to root out the enmity of the carnal heart, unbelief, the resistance of human will; He is able to save the soul from its desperate disease, though its sins are red as scarlet, rankling in bitterness and

malice, and though the sinner has wandered unto the ends of the world. The strongest temptations of satan cannot bind with fetters which Christ cannot break and deliver the penitent captive. And when we are saved from sin, Christ is abundantly able to sustain and defend us, for He is our strength in weakness, we partake of His righteousness, wisdom, sanctification, and redemption. His salvation is full and glorious.

In the doctrine of the fulness of Christ, we see attributes and prerogatives which fully qualify Him to be the chief of the physical world, and Lord of all intelligent beings. He created all worlds, by His wisdom and power, for His own purpose and glory; He maintains supremacy over all without the semblance of usurpation, for this government was His own right; He keeps the machinery of the universe in motion by His will, when and where He pleases. In Him was also the fountain of grace, the effective power to work out salvation from sin, to purify the heart, refine the character, and give vigorous spiritual life, and qualify believers for heaven. Christ alone can work out a complete salvation and lift us up into a glorified state. Christ was the chief from the dead; He conquered death and spoiled the grave, and entered into His glory; therefore He is able to rescue His saints from the dominion of darkness and corruption, the foul prison-house of death, and utter the choral song of triumph, "O, grave, where is thy victory;" and then all the redeemed shall joyously, in a loud shout, respond, "Thanks be unto God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

When we reach the other shore and walk the land of pure delight, and then look back and fully realize what God has done for us and in us, how beautiful will Christ appear to us in the fulness of His perfections, grace and goodness. How full of joy the thought, that Christ was able and willing to save, and how wisely and mercifully He has accomplished the whole work. We shall then fully know what it is to be redeemed, glorified, and be forever perfect, standing firmly on truth and holiness, as on a sea of glass, with the harps of

God, among the saints of light, at rest. On each brow will shine the crown, in the hand the palm, and all robed in white. A countless company it will be, congenial in feeling and purpose, forever safe, forever happy. Shall we all be there?

ARTICLE VII.

HARTWICK SEMINARY.

By Rev. WILLIAM HULL, Hudson, N. Y.

A history of the oldest Theological Seminary in the State of New York, and of the oldest theological school of the Lutheran Church in the United States, cannot fail to be of interest to the readers of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY REVIEW. Having, as Secretary of the Board of Trustees, recently come into possession of its records, the writer uses these documents, and others to which he has had access, to present an outline of the history of the Institution.

I. ITS FOUNDER.

Rev. John Christopher Hartwick was a native of the Dukedom of Saxa-Gotha, in the province of Thuringia, in Germany, where he was born in 1714. He was sent to this country as a missionary preacher of the Gospel, upon the petition and call of Lutheran congregations in the counties of Albany and Dutchess. In what year he came is uncertain. In 1748 he was laboring as a Lutheran pastor in New Jersey, and in the same year he participated in the organization of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania—the oldest Lutheran Synod in this country. He served Lutheran congregations in New York, Massachusetts, Maine, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. On account of personal peculiarities he remained but a short time in one place. He never married, and manifested an aversion for the other sex.

In 1754 he, with ten other persons, purchased twenty-one thousand five hundred acres of land of the Indians in Otsego County, south of Otsego Lake, on the Susquehanna river; and

which is now comprised in the town of Hartwick. Seven years passed before the grant was confirmed and letters patent issued to the purchasers by the English government. Subsequently he bought the interest of seven of the patentees, thus securing eight-elevenths of the whole. The land was divided into eleven sections and apportioned among the proprietors, which put him in possession of about sixteen thousand acres. This part of the State was then one of the border settlements, and the land had but a small pecuniary value.

In 1791, five years previous to his death, he appointed an agent, with authority to dispose of all the land except three thousand acres, which he reserved for himself; and in less than a year thirteen thousand acres were leased, in various quantities, to thirty-four different proprietors, for ten years, at an annual rent of one shilling an acre; with the privilege of purchase at the end of that time at fourteen shillings an acre. Subsequently the agent bought many of these leases, and at the end of the ten years, which reached beyond Mr. Hartwick's death, he became the full proprietor on paying the specified purchase price; so that when Mr. Hartwick died, in 1796, his landed estate was comparatively small, and all his assets amounted to only about fifteen thousand dollars.

This he put to a good use. By a will, which was proved in the Surrogates's Court of Albany County, in 1797, he appointed Hon. Jeremiah Van Rensselaer, of Albany, executor of his estate, to establish a theological and classical school on his lands in Otsego County. In a codicil, he added as executor, Rev. Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg, then Speaker of the House of Representatives. He also appointed in his will Rev. John C. Kunze, of New York, and Rev. Dr. Helmuth, of Philadelphia, as Curators, who on the establishment of the Institution, in securing teachers, were "to provide proper, learned and godly persons, regularly qualified, according to the discipline of the Evangelical Church, adhering to the Augustan Confession."

He speaks in his will of the proposed institution as a "Seminarium Theologicum," and of the "Theological Faculty of the Seminarium," in which proper persons were to be

qualified for preaching the Gospel, particularly to the natives, whom he denominated Gentiles. The will, with its various codicils, shows the great eccentricity of the man. He contemplated the building of a town on his lands, to be called the New Jerusalem. He also devised one hundred acres of land, to be laid out as a glebe for an evangelical minister, to be called and appointed by the Faculty of the Seminary, and he contemplated having preaching in the Institution every day, at an hour when the community might attend morning and evening prayers.

On the 4th of June, 1799, Jeremiah Van Rensselaer, of Albany, who had been the attorney and business agent of Mr. Hartwick, qualified as an executor under the will, by accepting the trust and taking the required oath for its faithful performance; on the 19th of the same month, Rev. Frederick Augustus Muhlenberg qualified in the same manner as the other executor.

Rev. Dr. Helmuth, of Philadelphia, one of the curators or literary directors mentioned in the will, declined to act. Mr. Hartwick had placed his estate at the disposal of the executors and curators, for the execution of his pious design, to establish a theological school.

II. ITS ESTABLISHMENT.

The two executors and Rev. John C. Kunze, the acting curator, held their first meeting in the city of New York, on the 15th of September, 1797, and they resolved, in accordance with the will of the testator, to found a Theological and Missionary Seminary; but they were not prepared at once to decide where it should be located. Rev. Dr. John C. Kunze was appointed Literary Director, at a salary of five hundred dollars, and Rev. A. T. Braun, pastor of the Lutheran Church at Albany, his assistant, at a salary of two hundred and fifty dollars. They also appointed Rev. John Frederick Ernst to go to the patent and preach to the inhabitants, and direct the education of their children, at a salary of two hundred and fifty dollars a year and the use of one hundred acres of land.

These sums would consume all the annual income of the estate.

When it became known that the executors intended to found a theological Seminary, New York City, Rhinebeck, Albany, Schoharie, and Cooperstown, were desirous of having it located in those respective places.

Mr. Muhlenberg having died, the management depended upon Jeremiah Van Rensselaer, of Albany, and Rev. Dr. Kunze, of New York, who decided to locate the school in Albany, and to effect that purpose they entered into an agreement with the Trustees of the Lutheran Church in Albany, to administer the trust under the direction of two curators, who were to have power to nominate their successors, and one of whom must be a Lutheran minister in connection with the New York Ministerium. Dr. Kunze was at liberty to move to Albany as soon as he chose to do so, and in the meantime he was to instruct students of divinity at his residence in New York City, and beginners, intended for the ministry, were to receive their instructions at Albany from Rev. Mr. Braun.

The trustees of the Church at once began active operations. They selected a site for the proposed Seminary; issued proposals for a suitable building, and commenced the foundation. But the inhabitants of the Hartwick patent were not pleased with this arrangement. They insisted that according to the provisions of the will the Seminary must be located on the lands of the patentee, and they raised money to prosecute the executor. About the same time a resolution was introduced into the Legislature, inquiring whether the property of Mr. Hartwick had not escheated to the state for want of proper heirs.

These obstacles so discouraged the trustees of the church, that in 1808 they re-delivered the property of the Hartwick estate into the hands of Jeremiah Van Rensselaer, the only remaining representative, (Dr. Kunze, having died the previous year), and they sold the materials used in the foundation of the building.

Jeremiah Van Rensselaer died in 1810, and in his will he

appointed John G. Knauff, a trustee of the Lutheran Church in Albany, and a practicing physician, his successor as executor. Dr. Knauff at once consulted with the officers of the New York Ministerium, and resolved to establish the Seminary on the patent. In 1812 he commenced the erection of a brick building, thirty-six by forty-eight feet in size, and twenty-two feet high, besides the basement story—the whole containing fourteen rooms. He secured the services of Rev. Dr. Ernst L. Hazelius as Principal, and John A. Quitman, (afterward Major General Quitman), son of Rev. Dr. Quitman of Rhinebeck, as Assistant, and the school went into operation on the 15th of December, 1815, and during the first term the roll of students numbered forty-four. Thus nearly twenty years had rolled by since the death of the testator, and now his benevolent designs were put into execution.

III. ITS INCORPORATION.

Dr. Knauff was not willing to bear the responsibility of directing a Theological Seminary alone, and thereupon application was made to the Legislature for a charter. An act was passed on the 17th of April 1817, reciting in the preamble, that Mr. Hartwick had died seized of a considerable estate, which, "by his last will and testament he devised for the endowment of a Literary and Theological Seminary, to be established within the bounds of a tract of land, whereof he died seized, situate in the town of Hartwick, Otsego County." The preamble further states that, "one of the declared objects of the said testator was to promote the education of pious young men for the gospel ministry in the Lutheran Church, whereof he was a member"—that John G. Knauff the present trustee, had erected a commodious school building, and had employed a respectable Lutheran minister of competent talents and learning to conduct the school—that he had agreed upon a plan with the reverend Synod of the Lutheran Church for the incorporation of the Institution, and prayed the Legislature to authorize and direct the Regents of the University to grant a charter incorporating the Institution, by the name of, "The Hartwick Seminary."

The Act directs the Regents to grant an act of incorporation in the usual form of their charters, "except that the Principal of the said Seminary shall always be a Lutheran minister of good standing, and that a majority of the Trustees shall always be Lutheran clergymen and laymen, whose duty it shall be, in addition to the other branches of education to be taught in the said Seminary, to teach candidates for the gospel ministry, in the said Seminary, a regular system of Theology."

The Trustees named in the Act were Rev. Frederick H. Quitman, of Rhinebeck, Rev. Henry Möller, of Sharon, Rev. Augustus Wackerhagen, of Schoharie, Rev. Frederick G. Mayer of Albany, Leonard Fisher, of the City of New York, William C. Bouck, of Schoharie, Daniel Simmons, of Brunswick, Philip Talbert, of Albany, Rev. Daniel Nash, Nathan Davison, Samuel Crafts, and Thomas Loomis, of the town of Hartwick. It was provided that John G. Knauff should, under the direction of the Chancellor, pass over to the Trustees the full Hartwick estate; subject to such sums as the Chancellor should allow him for services, costs, charges and expenditures in the execution of his trust.

On the 30th of August, 1816, the Regents incorporated the Board, which held its first meeting in Albany on the 4th of September, 1816, and organized with Rev. Dr. Quitman the senior Trustee in the chair, and the choice of Rev. Augustus Wackerhagen as Secretary. The Trustees have by the charter power of perpetual succession, and they fill their own vacancies.

IV. ITS PROPERTY.

A schedule of the property, prepared on the 26th of August 1817, showed assets to the amount of \$19,765.56, which included eighteen shares in the Western Inland Lock Navigation Company, valued at \$1,500, which afterward became worthless—also fifty shares in the Second Great Western Turnpike company of the value of \$1,250, which also afterward became worthless. Subtracting these, we have \$17,015 as the endowment, besides the Seminary lot and building

valued at \$4,275, and the Principal's house which cost \$2,507.

In 1841 two wings were added to the main building, thirty-five by thirty-one feet in size, and two stories high, which contained sixteen additional rooms and cost about \$1800.

In 1866 the Board of Trustees resolved to rebuild the Seminary edifice—to take down the stone wings erected in 1841—to add wings of brick three stories high, and much larger than the ones which had preceded them—to add a story to the main building, and to finish the basement for a boarding department. This was accomplished at a cost of about \$21,500, and the buildings are now ample, beautiful, and in excellent repair.

According to the last report of the Treasurer, made June 26th, 1878, the endowment was \$15,527; about \$1,500 less than it was in 1818, after an expenditure of over \$25,000 in the intervening years on account of buildings. In 1818 the property of the Seminary, including buildings, libraries, philosophical apparatus and endowment, aggregated \$26,870,31. In 1878 the same aggregated \$50,359,80.

The endowment suffered so little in the large expenditure in building, in 1866, was owing to the valuable labors of Rev. William N. Scholl, D. D., in canvassing a large number of the churches soliciting aid for the Institution.

V. ITS LIBRARIES.

Rev. John Christopher Hartwick had deposited a collection of books for safe keeping with Union College, and it was not until 1823 that Mr. Bouck succeeded in getting them.

Donations to the Library are acknowledged in the minutes of the Board of Trustees from Rev. Henry Møller, Rev. Augustus Wackerhagen, Rev. F. A. Schaeffer, Rev. Ernst L. Hazelius, Rev. Simeon Dederick, Rev. Reuben Dederick, Hon. Samuel Nelson, Dr. H. H. Muhlenberg, the New York Ministerium, Rev. Dr. Henry N. Pohlman, Hon. Sherman Page, Mrs. Rev. John Selmsier, Mrs. Judge Danforth, Mrs. Rev. James Lefler and others. In 1839 the Library com-

prised 836 volumes, valued at \$1,137.24—in 1878 the libraries contained 2288 volumes, valued at \$4,650. The philosophical apparatus cost \$780. The ladies of St. James' Church, New York City, in 1866, at the time of the rebuilding, donated \$500 for an increase in the philosophical apparatus.

Rev. Dr. Scholl secured a large number of books from publishers and others for the libraries.

The gift of nearly eight hundred volumes of bound pamphlets, by Rev. Dr. Pohlman, was the most valuable gift ever received for the libraries of the Institution. It is said to be the second largest collection of the kind in the United States. It was the work of a lifetime to gather it, and its value can hardly be estimated. Each volume has an index, and there is a general index to the whole, prepared by the indefatigable donor.

VI. ITS SOCIETIES.

The Philophronean Society was organized in 1816, and continues until this time. Its roll of membership comprises over fifteen hundred names, and its library a choice selection of volumes. It meets weekly for debate, declamation, and composition. Another society, called the Clionian, was organized at one time, but it existed only a few years and was absorbed by the older society.

A Theological Society has been in operation for many years under the presidency of the Professor in Theology, where skeletons of sermons are submitted and discussed and short sermons delivered. It has also a valuable library.

ITS TRUSTEES.

The first Board of Trustees included clergymen who had been educated in Europe, such as Revs. Dr. Quitman, Dr. Wackerhagen, and Møller. As these passed away, their places were filled by Alumni of the institution, such as Revs. Dr. Pohlman, Dr. Strobel, Dr. Charles A. Smith, Dr. Senderling, Jacob Berger and others. These in turn are departing, and later graduates are filling their places, such as Revs. Van Alstine, Empie, Kling, Hull, and Dr. Magee.

The following comprise the Trustees of the Institution

with their years of service: Rev. Dr. Frederick H. Quitman, 1816-1828; Rev. Augustus Wackerhagen, 1816-1845; Rev. Henry Möller, 1816-1827; Rev. Frederick G. Mayer, 1816-1843; Leonard Fisher, 1816-1819; Hon. William C. Bouck, 1816-1859; Daniel Simmons, 1816-1836; Philip Talbert, 1816-1819; Rev. Daniel Nash, 1816-1833; Nathan Davison, 1816-1821; Samuel Crafts, 1816-1818; Thomas Loomis, 1816-1822; Farrand Stranahan, 1818-1825; Philip N. Bonesteel, 1819-1846; Rev. Peter W. Domeier, 1819-1829; Jerome Clark, 1821-1864; Araunah Metcalf, 1822-1845; Joseph D. Husbands, 1825-1833; John C. Möller, M. D. 1827-1849; Rev. Dr. Geo. N. Lintner, 1828-1872; Rev. John D. Lawyer, 1829-1856; Robert Campbell, 1833-1848; Hon. Samuel Nelson, 1833-1874; Rev. Jacob Berger, 1836-1842; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1842-1868; Rev. Dr. Henry N. Pohlman, 1843-1874; Philip W. Engs, 1845-1864; Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, 1846-1856; Rev. Dr. Jacob Z. Senderling, 1846-1878; Richard Cooper, 1848-1849; Hon. John H. Prentiss, 1849-1861; Rev. Dr. William N. Scholl, 1849-1855; Hon. H. H. Van Dyck, 1855-1870; Rev. Philip Wieting, 1856-1870; Rev. James R. Kaiser, 1856-1859; Hon. Lyman Sanford, 1859, to present time; Rev. Dr. William N. Scholl to present time; Rev. Andrew Wetzel, 1862,—A. F. Ockershausen, Sen., 1864-1877; George Goertner, 1864, to present time; Ephraim Swartswout, 1868, to present time; Rev. William Hull to present time; Rev. Marcus W. Empie, 1871, to present time; Rev. Nicholas Van Alstine, 1871, to present time; Rev. Henry L. Dox, 1872-1876; William C. Davison, 1874, to present time; Rev. Dr. Irving Magee, 1875, to present time; Rev. Marcus Kling, 1876 to present time; F. V. Heydenreich, 1878, to present time.

PRESIDENTS OF THE BOARD.

Rev. Dr. Quitman, 1816-1828; Rev. Dr. Wackerhagen, 1828-1845; Hon. William C. Bouck, 1845-1859; Jerome Clark, 1859-1863; Rev. Dr. Geo. A. Lintner, 1863-1872; Rev. Dr. H. N. Pohlman, 1872-1874; Hon. Lyman Sanford, 1874, to present time.

SECRETARIES OF THE BOARD.

Rev. Dr. Aug. Wackerhagen, 1816-1828; Jos. D. Husbands, 1828-1833; Robert Campbell, 1834-1848; Richard Cooper, 1848-1849; Hon. John H. Prentiss, 1849-1861; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1861-1868; A. F. Ockershausen, 1868-1877; Rev. William Hull, 1877 to present time.

TREASURERS OF BOARD.

Philip Talbert, 1816-1819; Farrand Stranahan, 1819-1824; Jerome Clark, 1824-1864; George Clark, 1864-1869; Hon. Lyman Sanford, 1869, to present time.

FINANCIAL AGENTS.

Hon. William C. Bouck, 1816-1845; Hon. Lyman Sanford, 1845 to present time.

VII. ITS FACULTY.

Principals.—Rev. Dr. Ernst L. Hazelius, from 1815-1830; Rev. Dr. George B. Miller, 1830-1839; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1840-1844; Rev. Dr. Henry I. Schmidt, 1844-1848; Rev. Dr. George B. Miller, 1848-1850; Rev. Dr. Levi Sternberg, 1851-1864; Rev. Dr. William N. Scholl, 1865-1870; Rev. T. T. Titus, 1871-1872; Rev. James Pitcher, 1872 to present time.

Professors of Theology.—Rev. Dr. E. L. Hazelius from 1816-1830; Rev. Dr. George B. Miller 1830-1839; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1840-1844; Rev. Dr. George B. Miller, 1844-1869; Rev. T. T. Titus, 1871-1873; Rev. P. Bergstresser, 1874-1876; Rev. James Pitcher, 1876 to present time.

Assistant Teachers.—John A. Quitman, Henry N. Pohlman, Jacob Z. Senderling, Jacob Berger, Charles Wessels, H. Hayunga, Philip Wieting, Thomas Lape, George B. Miller, Christian B. Thümmel, Mr. Springer, Henry I. Schmidt, Levi Sternberg, John Frederick Winkler, George Neff, Henry Hawley, John J. Crafts, William E. Snyder, George H. Miller, John D. English, Irving Magee, Augustus T. Wieting, Charlotte M. Miller, Cornelius M. Myers, Alfred Hiller, Andrew Spenser, Anna J. Miller, George M. Sternberg, Henrietta Miller, John M. Hartwell, Mary R. Waters, Alansom N.

Daniels, John B. Steele, Maria Clark, James Pitcher, Adam Martin, William P. Evans, Chester H. Traver, George H. Prentice, John L. Kistler, Cora O. Barnard.

VIII. ITS ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

In 1849 its alumni formed an association, and an annual meeting has been held since that time, at which addresses have been delivered. In 1866 the Association made extensive arrangements for the celebration of the semi-centennial anniversary of the Seminary's history. It was a large and joyous gathering. Rev. Dr. Pohlman gave an historical address, and Rev. William Hull read a poem appropriate to the occasion. The Association published a beautiful memorial volume of nearly two hundred pages, containing these, and other matter relating to the history of the Institution.

IX. CLAIMANTS.

From time to time, persons claiming to be heirs at law of John Christopher Hartwick, have threatened to commence litigation for the estate he left; but thus far there has been no action undertaken. As early as 1820, claims of this kind were made, as appears from the minutes of the Board. The President and Secretary were appointed a committee to examine these claims, and they reported at the next meeting of the Board that the claimants had not appeared. Mr. Hartwick, in his will, bequeathed one hundred acres of land to his sister's son, and this, in 1827, was conveyed by the Financial Agent, Ex-Gov. Bouck, to Rev. Mr. Siedel of Pennsylvania, who represented the heir.

The following provision in Mr. Hartwick's will left a door open for claims: "I ordain that the unsold land, mentioned in my last will, shall be let out on short leases, and that in case any of my relations of the name of Hartwig, bringing certificate from the parish minister of the parish and place they have belonged to, and also attestations of magistrates of the country, witnessing that they derive their origin from brothers of Andreas Hartwig, who the latter end of the last or the beginning of this present century, went from Seladen,

a town or village in the bishoprick of Hilderham, and afterward settled in Molschleben, a village a German mile from Gotha, shall be entitled to fifty, say fifty acres free and fifty on rent common with other tenants."

In 1829, Rev. Dr. Hazelius presented to the Board papers from parties in Germany, claiming a part of the Hartwick estate. They were referred to a committee, consisting of Messrs. Husbands, Clark, Metcalf, and Dr. Hazelius. Mr. Husbands, the secretary, made a very intelligent report, in which he contended that the Board was created by the Legislature to administer certain trusts, and that they were not a court to decide upon claims made by other parties. He concluded his report by saying: "I have searched in vain for any power conferred upon the trustees to alien and convey real estate which they hold for the benefit of the academy, to aliens in Germany, claiming under Mr. Hartwick's will. I am of the opinion that the trustees possess no such power!"

In 1843, Lewis Marquart and others of Rhinebeck, claimed one hundred acres of land under the will, and they threatened to prosecute, but the trustees rejected the claim, and they did not pursue the matter.

In 1875, an article appeared in one of the New York dailies, announcing that a man by the name of Mong had arrived in New York, representing twenty-seven heirs at law of Mr. Hartwick, and having a power of attorney from them to prosecute for the property of Mr. Hartwick, on the ground that the will was defective. It stated that Mong had retained a lawyer by the name of William H. Duryea to commence the action. The Board has not as yet heard from Mr. Mong or Mr. Duryea, and it is not probable that these alleged heirs will come into the possession of the Hartwick estate at any time in the future.

X. ITS LOCATION.

Mr. Hartwick evidently contemplated that the Seminary should be established on the lands of his patent, where he directed that a town should be laid out, and one hundred acres of land should be set apart as a glebe for the use of an

Evangelical minister, who was to be appointed by the Faculty. Morning and evening prayers at the Institution were to be attended by the people of the community. The Seminary and the town are several times alluded to in the various codicils to his will. When, therefore, there was an attempt to locate the Seminary in Albany, in 1801, the inhabitants of the patent remonstrated, and raised money to prosecute the executor, which led to the discontinuance of the attempt.

The Act passed by the legislature, April 17th, 1816, directing the Regents to incorporate the Seminary, recognizes the intention of the testator to establish it on his lands. The Act says: "Whereas the Rev. John C. Hartwick, deceased, by his last will and testament hath devised a considerable estate, for the endowment of a literary and theological seminary, *to be established within the bounds of a tract of land whereof he died seized, situated in the town of Hartwick, in the county of Otsego,*" &c.

In the charter of the Institution, granted by the Board of Regents, on the 13th of August, 1816, after referring to the Act authorizing the charter, they say: "Now, therefore, by virtue of the said Act, and in conformity to the provisions therein contained, we, the said Regents, have granted, ordained and declared, and by these presents do grant and declare, that a Seminary for the education of pious young men, for the gospel ministry in the Lutheran Church, in addition to other branches of education to be taught therein, be established *in the said town of Hartwick, in the county of Otsego*, to be known and distinguished by the name and style of 'The Hartwick Seminary.'"

At that time the location was tedious of access. It was before the era of railroads, and it involved a stage ride of seventy-five miles from Albany.

When afterward the New York Central Railroad was built, it reduced the stage ride, from Fort Plain to Hartwick, to thirty-one miles; and when subsequently the Albany and Susquehanna Railroad was built, the stage ride was reduced to twelve miles; and now the Cooperstown branch carries the visitor to within half a mile of the door. Otsego county

adjoins Schoharie, which has the largest number of General Synod Lutheran churches of any county in the State.

In 1833, an attempt was made to remove the Institution to the village of Cooperstown, four miles distant, where the trustees were offered, free from encumbrance, "The Cooperstown Female Seminary." An effort was made to secure an Act of the Legislature to authorize the removal, but it failed. At a subsequent time, when a removal was spoken of, Hon. Samuel Nelson, a trustee of the Institution from 1833-1874, and one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, said, that when the effort at removal in 1833 occurred, that every lawyer in Cooperstown (the county town of Otsego county) gave it as his opinion, that the inhabitants of the town of Hartwick had such vested rights in the Institution that it could not be moved, even with the consent of the Legislature.

There was more or less talk about some other location, (which is no unusual thing in the history of institutions of learning) until 1866, when the trustees contemplated renewing and enlarging the buildings, and then they proposed that if the inhabitants of the town would raise five thousand dollars for the building fund, the question of removal should be finally settled, and that town be regarded as the permanent location of the Institution. The inhabitants of Hartwick accepted the proposition, raised and paid over the money to the Treasurer of the Board, and thus settled perpetually the question of location.

In regard to the situation of the Seminary, Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, who received his education there, in the "Memorial Volume" above alluded to, says: "Those who have studied most thoughtfully and intelligently the laws of influence, are aware that natural scenery has much to do with the formation of character. And, therefore, we think the literary institutions of the land, as far as may be, should be planted away from the din and materialism of the city, where the valleys smile and the mountains fling their solemn shadows. In every sphere and calling of life, we need more of the pur-

ifying, elevating power of nature's forms to shape and move the mind, and inspire it with sentiments and tastes that shall shield it from the secularizing tendency of worldly pursuits. Student life forms stronger attachments, we believe, among the everlasting hills, than amid the noise and smoke of thickly populated towns."

"There is a theology in nature which accords with the theology of the Bible, and from which the student may derive illustrations and arguments without number for the enforcement of the principles announced by inspired prophets and apostles. The study of nature is a discipline and a help for the investigation of higher truth. It imparts to the mind materials of enlarged and varied thought, and a power of presentation, not only more captivating, but also more persuasive than can be acquired by mere scholastic learning, however profound and exhaustless it may be."

"In the secluded valley that shelters Hartwick Seminary from the busy world, nature has scattered her gifts with a generous profusion. The hills wild with wood-land, or tamed by the hand of cultivation into grain-fields and pastures, recede gently, undisturbed in their repose by rugged cliffs or frowning battlements of torn rocks. The Susquehanna is bright and beautiful here as river can be, never impetuous, but purling now and then, as it runs with quickened pace through some narrow channel; or laughing in sportive leaps as it encounters a resistant stone, or the branch of some overhanging tree. Orchards and hop-fields and rich meadows interspersed with groups of trees, so harmonize and blend as to form pictures of surpassing loveliness in every direction."

XI. ITS GOVERNMENT.

As remarked above, the charter makes its trustees a self-perpetuating body, subject only to the condition that a majority of the twelve trustees shall always be Lutheran clergymen or laymen. From time to time dissatisfaction was expressed with what was termed a "close corporation." Some thought the Lutheran Synods of the State and New Jersey should have a direct voice in its government. This

led the trustees at the annual session of the board, in 1871, to pass a resolution that they would, as vacancies occurred, give the three Synods each a representation of three in the Board, with three from the patent, or at large. Since that time as vacancies have occurred, the Synod entitled to the trustee has made the nomination, which has been confirmed by the election of the person named to the Board.

XII. ITS THEOLOGICAL CHARACTER.

It was intended by its founder to be a *Theological* Institution—the Act of the Legislature authorizing its incorporation recognizes its theological character—the charter especially enjoins upon the trustees that, “they shall, in addition to the other branches of education to be taught in said Seminary, *teach candidates for the gospel ministry a regular system of theology.*” This they have done for sixty-two years, and it is not likely that in the future they will violate this provision of the charter, and the declared intention of the founder.

XIII. ITS USEFULNESS.

About one hundred Lutheran ministers have received their education, in whole or in part, within its halls. A complete list of its students from the beginning, does not exist, but they number thousands. The Philophronean Society has a complete record of its membership, numbering over fifteen hundred names. The Institution has been blessed with learned and excellent professors during its whole history. A large number of the Lutheran churches of the State of New York have been founded by ministers educated in the Institution.

The good it has accomplished, in the sixty-two years of its history, will never be realized, until the results are contemplated in the eternal world. Still the good work goes on. Within the last year, nine young men preparing for the gospel ministry, have received instruction at the hands of the two capable Lutheran clergymen who in part comprise its faculty.

Its area of territory does not justify the anticipation that it will equal in the number of its students some other of our

Lutheran institutions more centrally located as to the congregations of the Church. The General Synod is represented in the States of New York and New Jersey by about one hundred congregations, and as the territory is now so well settled, there is no probability of an increase in their number, except in the cities, where English Lutheran churches may be formed from the youth of the German congregations. The Lutheran Church in these two States needs a Literary and Theological school to meet the wants of the population, and this they have in Hartwick Seminary with its commodious buildings, its large libraries, and its capable faculty.

We cannot fail to be impressed, in considering this history with the magnitude of the good which has been accomplished on the small investment of fifteen thousand dollars. We cannot realize what mental and moral enlightenment has come from the use of that comparatively small sum. Without Hartwick Seminary, the Lutheran Church in New York would not be what it is to-day. Had the eccentric, but deeply pious, founder left his estate to his foreign relatives, all trace of it would long since have been lost; but leaving it for the mental and spiritual enlightenment of his fellowmen, it has been a perennial source of good, and to the end of time it will doubtless continue in its career of usefulness, bearing the name of its founder, whose memory will be borne to the coming ages as a benefactor of his race, and which without the humble gift he bestowed, would almost have been lost in oblivion. When it comes to the accounting, it will appear that the money placed in the hands of John Christopher Hartwick, was so faithfully administered, that our Lord will receive His own with usury. We have reason to pray God, that He would raise up many such stewards for the promotion of human good and the advancement of His kingdom.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

During the summer months, as usual, the press has been occupied in meeting the demand for lighter reading, and has given us comparatively few books of the more substantial kinds and in the higher order of discussions. The list, however, contains some volumes of value.

AMERICAN.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Salvator Mundi*, or Is Christ the Saviour of all Men, by Samuel Cox; *The Present Trial of Faith*, being Sermons preached in St. Martin's Church, Leicester, by David J. Vaughan; *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, with Notes, Comments, Maps, and Illustrations, by Rev. Lyman Abbott; *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, with Notes, critical, explanatory and practical, by Rev. H. Cowles; *Life After Death*, or Post-Mortem Accountability, by Rev. Jos. A. Seiss, D. D.; *The Atonement*, viewed as assumed divine responsibility, traced as the fact attested in divine revelation, shown to be the truth harmonizing Christian theories, and recognized as the grace realized in human experience, by Dr. G. W. Samson.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*The Principles of Light and Color*, illus., by Edward D. Babbitt; *Annual Record of Science and Industry* for 1877, by Spencer F. Baird; *The Speaking Telephone, Talking Phonograph*, and other novelties, by Geo. B. Prescott; *How to Take Care of Our Eyes*, with Advice to Parents and Teachers in regard to the management of the eyes of children, by H. C. Angell; *Ethics, or Moral Philosophy*, by W. C. Hill.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Artist Biographies*—Michael Angelo, by M. F. Sweester; *A Hand-Book of Politics* for 1878, being a Record of important Political Action, National and State, from July 15, 1876, to July 1, 1878, by Edw. McPherson; *Short Studies of Great Lawyers*, by Irving Browne; *Life of Madame de la Rochefoucauld*, Duchess of Doudeauville, and Founder of the Society of Nazareth, by La Rochefoucauld, translated from the French; *Men of Mark*, or Heroes of English History, by Wm. Marshall; *History of the Gipsies*, with Specimens of the Gipsy language, by Walter Simson, edited with notes by Jas. Simson, 2d ed.; *Sir Walter Scott*, (English Men of Letters, ed. by J. Morley), by Richard H. Hutton.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Railroads*, their Origin and Problems, by Chas. F. Adams, Jr.; *The New Paul and Virginia*, or Positivism on an Island, by W. H. Mallock; *Through the Dark Continent*, or the Sources

of the Nile around the great Lakes of Equatorial Africa and down the river to the Atlantic Ocean, with maps and 150 illust., by Henry M. Stanley.

BRITISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*The Gospel of Forgiveness*, discourses, by B. S. Candlish; *The Lord's Supper*, its Nature, by T. Houlston; *The Christian Code*, or Rule for the Conduct of Human Life, by H. T. J. Macnamara; *The Homilist*, Vol. V., enlarged series, edited by Dr. Thomas; *Natural Theology of the Nineteenth Century*, by J. Maclaren; *Studies on the Times of Abraham*, by G. Tomkins.

PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE.—*Essay on the Sacred Language, Writing, and Religion of the Parsis*, by M. Haug; *The Philosophy of Existence*, or Reality and Romance of Histories, by E. G. Kelley; *Egyptian Belief and Modern Thought*, by J. Berwick.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.—*The Gold Mines of Midian and the Ruined Midianite Cities*, by R. F. Burton; *The Approaching End of the Age* reviewed in the light of History, by H. Guinness; *Islam*, its Origin, Genius, and Mission, by J. J. Lake; *History of the Indian Mutiny*, Vol. I., by G. B. Malleson; *Early Records of British India*, a History of English Settlements in India by J. T. Wheeler; *Diderot and the Encyclopædists*, 2 vols., J. B. Mozley; *The Empires and Cities of Asia*, by A. G. Forbes.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Art and Art Industries in Japan*, by B. Alcock; *Dr. Johnson*, His Friends and His Critics, by G. B. Hill; *The Europeans in India*, etc., by E. C. P. Hull; *Moab's Patriarchal Stone*, being an Account of the Moabite Stone, by J. King.

ARTICLE IX.

HOUGHTON, OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Memoirs of Jean Francois Marmontel. With an Essay by William D. Howells. In two volumes. pp. 272 and 243. 1878.

These two neat volumes belong to the series of "Choice Autobiographies" which the publishers are issuing under the editorship of Mr. Howells. The series is intended for general reading, and designed to include the famous autobiographies of all languages, affording, in a compact edition, all that is best in this valuable kind of literature.

Marmontel, whose "Memoirs" of himself are worthily placed in this series, was one of the brilliant group of literary men of France during the reign of Louis XV. He was one of the 'encyclopædists,' and was personally associated with Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, D'Alembert,

Buffon, Thomas, Chastellux, Morellet, St. Lambert, Grimm, Helvetius, Raynal, D'Holbach, Galiani, and others, whose names stand out most prominently in that stirring, gay, and dissolute period. In the course of Marmontel's sketch of himself, all these men then most distinguished in literature and society, are made to appear, delineated in the clear and life-like view which his facile pen could give so well. It becomes, therefore, to a great degree, a picture of those times, and we are privileged, in it, to see the various figures move in the light of the parts they acted in the strange world which was at that day formed by the life of France, and especially of Paris. We are permitted to have a close view of the disposition, personal character, and mode of thought and life of such men as Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and their associates. We see how they lived and did their work. Though it is far from gratifying, it is yet instructive, thus to learn the vanity, the intrigues, the selfishnesses and littlenesses of men whose names attained a celebrity so historical as theirs. Their infidelity and irreligion produced no moral fruits, either in themselves or for their country soon swept by the horrors of the reign of terror, to recommend it to the reader. Few periods furnish a history so fraught with serious lessons. The author's sketches give pictures not only of the literary groups, but of the life of the times as lived by different classes, from the common ranks to the occupants of the royal palace. His account of the village home in which he spent his early life, presents a scene of innocence and virtue in striking contrast with the vices and corruption that held sway in the capital, among the nobility and in the court where the ambitious mistress, Madame Pompadour, ruled the king.

Though Marmontel wrote a great deal, and some of his productions, especially his *Moral Tales*, enjoyed a high popularity, the "Memoirs" here given are probably the most valuable. "Read the MEMOIRS," says Sainte-Beuve, "nothing but the Memoirs."

These volumes are very fittingly introduced to the reader's interest by Mr. Howells' judicious and enjoyable essay. They are gotten out in the "Little Classic" style, and are well worthy of a place in our libraries of choice autobiographical literature.

ARTIST BIOGRAPHIES.

<i>Titian.</i>	pp. 160.	
<i>Raphael.</i>	pp. 153.	
	<i>Dürer.</i>	pp. 158.
	<i>Murillo.</i>	pp. 136.
<i>Claude Lorraine.</i>	pp. 154.	<i>Rembrandt.</i> pp. 162.
	<i>Sir Joshua Reynolds.</i>	pp. 176.
	<i>Michael Angelo.</i>	pp. 157.
	<i>Guido Reni.</i>	pp. 160.

The increasing popular interest in art and its history is made the reason, by Messrs. Houghton, Osgood & Co., for the publication of a

uniform series of biographies of the most eminent artists of mediæval and modern times. The series is meant to possess the qualities of reliability, compactness and cheapness, and the work of preparation is intrusted to Mr. M. F. Sweester.

In the nine small, but neat volumes named above, we have evidence that the work is being well done. Mr. Sweester has written with excellent judgment and taste, and given a most attractive biography of each of the artists in the list. They are brief, but full enough for satisfactory portrayal of the men and their labors, and admirably suited for popular reading. They are well adapted to increase the popular interest in art-studies, in response to which the series has been projected. A preface to each volume mentions most of the literature on the subject, and the authorities used as sources in the preparation of the account. To each is appended a list of the artist's paintings now in existence, with their dates of execution and present location, as far as can be ascertained. Only in the case of Guido the date of execution is not given. A convenient index is also added to each. Other volumes of the series are to follow. Published at the low price of fifty cents each, they will bring a great amount of knowledge concerning the history of art within the reach of many who have not hitherto been able to gratify their desires in this direction.

Memorial and Biographical Sketches. By James Freeman Clarke. pp. 434. 1878.

We have no Introduction to this volume, or anything to guide us to any knowledge of its origin or genesis. It seems to be a collection of sketches made from different sources—some of them probably from periodicals, some delivered from the pulpit, and some called forth on other occasions. The title of the volume states its character—MEMORIAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES. These sketches are nineteen in number, and the subjects of them include prominent characters in various pursuits and walks of life. Most of them contain personal recollections and anecdotes concerning individuals known to the author, but some of them, as the sketches of Washington, Shakspeare, and Rousseau, are of men of by-gone times.

The general style of these sketches is very simple and easy. There seems to be little or no effort at fine writing. They are almost conversational in their easy manner, and enlivened by frequent anecdotes and illustrative facts. They make agreeable and instructive reading. It is enough to mention among the subjects, the names of John A. Andrew, Charles Sumner, Theodore Parker, Dr. Channing, Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, George D. Prentice, Gen. William Hull, to show that the sketches embrace distinguished characters, and that they are not confined to any particular class or school. These sketches in this respect may be styled miscellaneous.

The author makes no attempt, in these sketches, to conceal his own religious sentiments, but they are not offensively thrust upon the attention of the reader. Some of the subjects belong to his own school of religion or theology, but others to the very opposite. He is not blind to merit in those who differed most widely from him. Hardly any two men were less alike in their faith and religion than R. J. Breckenridge and James Freeman Clarke, and yet he can say: "Sleep peacefully in thy grave, good soldier of the cross. We who are fighting in another camp, to which thou wert not very friendly, can see and admire generous, brave, and honest qualities, and force of intellect and character, even in an opponent; and we lay this tribute on thy coffin."

We cannot criticise these sketches separately. They differ in length and merit, but the volume as a whole cannot fail to afford pleasure and profit to the reader. We welcome it to a place in our library among the class of works to which it belongs.

The Iliad of Homer. Translated into English Blank Verse, by William Cullen Bryant. Two volumes in one. pp. xviii., 332, 355. 1878.

This translation of Homer was one of Mr. Bryant's late literary works, and a monument of his devotion to literary pursuits even in old age. It was begun in 1865, and completed in 1869. The hold which this old Greek poem continues to have on both the cultivated and popular mind, is evinced in the fact, that two translations—and these the very best—have appeared in England and this country during the present generation, and within the last fifteen years. Derby and Bryant's translations will largely supplant those of Pope and Cowper. They are closer to the original and have more of its simplicity and power.

Mr. Bryant tells us what he has endeavored to do. "I have endeavored to be strictly faithful in my rendering; to add nothing of my own, and to give the reader, so far as our language would allow, all that I found in the original." Again: "I have endeavored to preserve the simplicity of style which distinguishes the old Greek poet, who wrote for the popular ear, and according to the genius of his language, and I have chosen such English as offers no violence to the ordinary usages and structure of our own."

The objects thus aimed at, those most competent to decide will agree, the translator has accomplished with a high degree of success. Those who read this translation will have the sum and substance of Homer's wonderful story, and will feel no little of the beauty and power of the original. No translation can ever convey all the beauty of the original of this grand old epic, but it is no small merit, and deserves all

praise, that Mr. Bryant has succeeded in this so far as he has. It is not too much to say that the average student of Homer will get a better knowledge of the poem from this translation, than he will from reading it in Greek with an imperfect knowledge of the original. Many who are unable to read Greek at all can enjoy Homer in this translation.

A few specimens will show how the work is done, and how it reads. The familiar beginning is thus rendered :

"O Goddess ! sing the wrath of Peleus' son,
Achilles ; sing the deadly wrath that brought
Woes numberless upon the Greeks, and swept
To Hades many a valiant soul, and gave
Their limbs a prey to dogs and birds of air,—
For so had Jove appointed,—from the time
When the two chiefs, Atreides, king of men,
And great Achilles, parted first as foes."

A part of the touching farewell interview between Hector and Andromache :

"So speaking, mighty Hector stretched his arms
To take the boy ; the boy shrank crying back
To his fair nurse's bosom, scared to see
His father helmeted in glittering brass,
And eying with affright the horse-hair plume
That grimly nodded from the lofty crest.
At this both parents in their fondness laughed ;
And hastily the mighty Hector took
The helmet from his brow and laid it down
Gleaming upon the ground, and, having kissed
His darling son and tossed him up in play,
Prayed thus to Jove and all the gods of heaven :—

"O Jupiter and all ye deities,
Vouchsafe that this my son may yet become
Among the Trojans eminent like me,
And nobly rule in Ilium. May they say,
'This man is greater than his father was !'
When they behold him from the battle-field
Bring back the bloody spoil of the slain foe,—
That so his mother may be glad at heart."

So speaking, to the arms of his dear spouse
He gave the boy ; she on her fragrant breast
Received him, weeping as she smiled. The chief
Beheld, and, moved with tender pity, smoothed
Her forehead gently with his hand and said :—

"Sorrow not thus, beloved one, for me.
No living man can send me to the shades
Before my time ; no man of woman born,
Coward or brave, can shun his destiny.
But go thou home, and tend thy labors there,—
The web, the distaff,—and command thy maids
To speed the work. The cares of war pertain
To all men born in Troy, and most to me."

The publishers have brought out this translation in different forms,

—2 vols. Royal 8vo. ; 2 vols. 16mo., Roslyn Edition ; and 2 vols. in one, full gilt, 12mo.—to suit the taste of purchasers and readers. The general make up and mechanical execution of the work is in excellent style. Nothing has been left undone to make this HOMER IN ENGLISH attractive to readers.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

[For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.]

Lectures on Mediæval Church History. Being the substance of Lectures delivered at Queen's College, London, by Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. pp. x., 444. 1878.

It is hardly necessary to commend anything from the pen of archbishop Trench. His name carries with it a guarantee of ripe scholarship and sound judgment, combined with careful study and preparation in writing. His numerous volumes have been welcomed and prized by many students, in this country, as well as in England. Few English writers have found their works so promptly republished in this country as archbishop Trench.

He appears here in a somewhat, though not altogether, new character. Some of his former works had borne witness to his large acquaintance with patristic and mediæval learning. But these Lectures on Mediæval Church History were delivered "to a class of girls, at Queen's College, London." It must certainly have been a most interesting sight—and most creditable to both parties—to see the learned author lecturing to a class of girls. We admire the taste and wisdom of the lecturer and his audience ; and we are deeply interested in his testimony, that, "having regard to receptive capacity, to the power of taking in, assimilating, and intelligently reproducing, what is set before them, my conviction after some experience in lecturing to the young of both sexes is, that there is no need to break the bread of knowledge smaller for young women than young men ; and I did not in the original preparation of these Lectures, nor yet have I in the later revision of them, because my class was, or was assumed to be, a female one, kept anything back that I should have thought it desirable to set before young men of the same age and condition in life."

These lectures are not, and do not profess to be, a complete history of the Mediæval Church. The author thinks, and no doubt truly, that for those who do not make a special study of such subjects, it is better to seize hold of the leading points or characters, and so to dwell upon them as to obtain a tolerably clear and lasting impression. Leading points will thus be fixed in the mind, and if less has been seen and heard, more will be remembered. So, instead of a continuous history, after the more common method, our author has furnished discussions of leading events, characters, controversies, etc. They are only the mountains and valleys he has noticed, leaving the broad

and less attractive plains for others to describe. His work is therefore very different from such a one as that of Neander, covering the same period. The two might well be studied together by those who desire fuller details than are given by archbishop Trench.

The Lectures are twenty-nine in number, extending, after an introductory one "on the study of Church History," "from "The Middle Ages beginning," and "The Conversion of England," to "The Eve of the Reformation." The volume is completed with an Index.

The intelligent reader will understand, from this general statement, that these Lectures cover a period, and embrace subjects, of profoundest interest. It is the period commonly known as the "dark ages," and yet in these "dark ages" were discussed and determined some of the leading subjects which have marked our modern Christianity. On the movements of these "dark ages" these Lectures throw a good measure of light. We see the leading figures and characters acting their part in this long play of a thousand years.

It would afford us pleasure to furnish illustrations of our author's treatment of different subjects, had we room, but we cannot. We may say that the Lectures are not very long, and there is very little that is dry or tedious in the details. The subjects are handled in the clear, matter-of-fact manner which marks the good common sense of English scholars. An extract from the Lecture on "The Eucharistic Controversy," will be specially timely and interesting to our readers, and must end this notice.

"A few words before we leave this theme. It is certainly a thought of infinite sadness that this Sacrament,—the very bond of innermost communion of the faithful with their Lord, and through Him with one another,—should have thus proved so often, and, in times which this course of Lectures does not reach, will be found to prove still more, a source and spring of strife and debate, dividing Churches, and then dividing again the divided. And yet from the bitter of this thought a sweet may be extracted. There is comfort even here. How priceless it and its benefits must have been felt to be, before men would contend for it as they have done, counting it as the very apple of their eye, so that he who wounded them here wounded them in a part at once the tenderest and the most vital; willing to set all upon the hazard, to taste all bitternesses, in exiles, in prisons, on scaffolds, at the fiery stake, for what they felt to be the truth of God in this matter. And no wonder. In the Sacraments, above all in this Sacrament, is the great abiding witness in the Church, a witness not in word only but also in act, against all merely rationalistic explanations of our relation to Christ and his to us. We are herein and hereby brought into real and direct contact with the whole Christ, and He with us; translated out of a spiritualistic world of shadows into a true kingdom of realities.

And another comforting thought may abate the sadness with which we contemplate the endless differences with which men have learned to regard this holiest mystery of all. No doubt there can be but one truth about it, and all which is not this is wrong. But those who miss this absolute truth, we are sometimes tempted to think of them as missing the blessing of that which they underrate, or,—I will say overrate, for that is impossible—which they wrongly rate. Let us be reassured. God is greater than our hearts. Many a one who, under imperfect teaching, has come to this as no more than a commemorative rite with some vague ill-defined solemnity clinging to it, has gone away strengthened and inwardly nourished, as he only shall fully know and understand in that day when Christ shall quicken the mortal bodies of his saints. God's purposes of grace are not so lightly defeated, the ordinances which He has appointed are not so easily robbed of their blessing, as we too often assume. Let us devoutly thank Him that the condition of receiving the grace of this heavenly feast does not lie in holding what Paschasius Radbert held about it, or in denying what Paschasius Radbert held about it; in being a Berengarian, or in being an anti-Berengarian. There are things which may be too high for us, too high for our understanding, but not too high for our using and enjoying; and of such things this is one, and the greatest."

Early Rome. From the foundation of the City to its destruction by the Gauls. By W. Ilme, Ph. D., Professor at the University of Heidelberg, author of "The History of Rome," with a Map. pp. 216.

This is another volume in the valuable Series, *Epochs of Ancient History*, narrating the History of Greece and Rome, and their relations to other countries at successive epochs. Already five volumes have appeared. This Series is deservedly popular, and will do much to promote the study of History, especially among the young. The different volumes are prepared by scholars who have made a special study of their subjects, and are published in a very neat and attractive style. It is deemed unnecessary to say more to commend these volumes to our readers.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.)

The Student's Ecclesiastical History. The History of the Christian Church during the first ten centuries from its foundation to the full establishment of the Holy Roman Empire and the Papal Power, by Philip Smith, B. A., author of the "Student's Old Testament History" and the "Student's New Testament History." With Illustrations. pp. xxxvi., 618. 1879.

It is a favorable symptom for the cause of Christianity and the

Church, that there is a demand for so many works treating of the History of the Church, and the workings of Christianity through the centuries since the Christian era. It is being felt more and more that it is the divine leaven, which has been working on, permeating and transforming human society. In spite of all that skeptics and materialists can urge, the evidence is too clear that great spiritual forces have been at work, and that what we call our advanced civilization is not so much the product of material agents as of the working of a divine Christianity. The study of the history of the Church must continue to attract more and more attention. It will not be confined to theological students and ministers of the gospel, but must become a necessity for all who would understand the great movements in the history of the world.

This work has been prepared to meet the want of a compendious history of the Christian Church, both for the student and the general reader. It is not designed to take the place of the numerous extended and learned works on this subject already in use, but to supply the lack of a compact and systematic presentation of the subject, such as many feel the need of. The author has had experience in this line of study and preparation of Histories. The "Student's Old Testament History" and the "Student's New Testament History," both published by Harper & Brothers, are from his pen, as well as the "Ancient History of the East."

It will be observed that the volume covers only the first ten centuries, and not the whole period of the History of the Church. During this period of a thousand years, it is designed to include all that especially relates to the universal Christian Church, in contrast with its national divisions. The work is divided into three Books, and they treat of the three ages, into which the whole is divided. The first age involves the first three centuries, styled the *PRIMITIVE AND PERSECUTED CHURCH*, the second age extends to the epoch of Pope Gregory the Great, embracing three centuries more, and the third age completes the thousand years.

The volume is unusually well supplied with the most important aids to render its use convenient and valuable. Besides the ordinary table of contents, we have nearly one hundred illustrations, a not very common feature in our Church Histories, a chronological table of nearly twenty pages, a list of Popes and Emperors, and very full Index. These are really valuable parts of the volume.

From a partial examination of the work, we have formed a favorable judgment of it for the purpose designed. The author does not profess to be free from strong convictions in regard to Christianity and the Christian Church. He writes as one who is in sympathy with his subject. This is just what candid men would expect and desire. He claims to have "studied to preserve impartiality," and we have no

good reason to doubt his candor or sincerity. It is possible, however, that in some matters affecting questions of church polity and ecclesiastical usages, the author may have been unconsciously biased in favor of methods and practices to which he has always been accustomed. The reader can readily make allowance for any seeming partialities of this kind. The author has availed himself of the latest and best authorities in preparing his work, and it will doubtless be found a most valuable addition in this department to the student and general reader, for whom especially it has been prepared.

Villages and Village Life, with Hints for their improvement, By Nathaniel Hillyer Egleston. pp. 326. 1878.

This is an interesting volume on a very interesting subject. If it does not treat of any thing very profound in science or philosophy, it does touch upon subjects most intimately connected with the health, domestic and social happiness and general welfare of the people. It may perhaps be ranged among books designed to afford pleasure in reading, but while it does this, it suggests many lessons of wisdom and instruction. At this time especially, when the overcrowded population of towns and cities raises the question of what can and must be done to meet the evil, the subject of *Village Life* will command attention. It is not strictly country life, but village life, of which our author treats, and yet it includes what is ordinarily understood by rural or country life.

The aim of the author is to help to a better appreciation of country life, and to make that life more nearly what its ideal should be. In the carrying out of this aim, he discusses numerous topics connected with life in the country, such as towns and country; Dullness in the country: means and occasions of social intercourse: village improvement societies, etc., etc.

Of the evils of the present tendency he says: "The country is depopulated: the city and town are overcrowded. The proper balance of population, and so the proper adjustment of life, of business, and of society, is lost. Life is not so desirable either in city or country as it otherwise would be. In the city, and largely because of the overcrowding, it is feverish and frivolous, and sometimes, ferocious. The extremes of good and evil there meet. In the country on the other hand, life is often dull and enfeebled and greatly deficient in the social element."

To make country life more attractive would be to diminish some of the evil under which society groans, and to increase the comfort and happiness of the race. The book is, by no means, a war upon city life. The author recognizes the mutual dependence of the country on the city, and of the city on the country. Such books, if read, will do good.

Annual Record of Science and Industry for 1877. Edited by Spencer F. Baird, with the assistance of Eminent Men of Science. pp. xiv., 480. 1878.

This is the seventh volume of a series commenced in 1871, and which has become a kind of necessity to all who would know the progress making in science and industry. The plan of the preparation and publication of this volume is somewhat changed from that of its predecessors.

"Heretofore," as we are told, "the 'Annual Record' has for the most part been composed, first, of a summary of scientific progress during the year; and, second, of a series of abstracts of the more important articles contained in the proceedings of learned societies and in the scientific and industrial journals of the day. With the rapid increase in the number of such papers, it has been found impossible to compress the abstracts in the limits necessarily assigned to the annual volume; and it has therefore been concluded to omit them entirely, and, by an extension of the Summaries, to furnish what will probably better answer the purposes of the student."

This has reduced the size of the volume, but its value still remains. Whoever desire to have a compact presentation of what is going on in the busy world of science and industry, will resort to these volumes. A brief statement will hardly convey a clear idea of the discoveries and improvements making in nearly every department embraced in the limits of the present volume. About forty pages are devoted to the subject of Astronomy, nearly as much space to Geography, about thirty pages to Agriculture, and corresponding attention to other topics. Under the head of INDUSTRIAL STATISTICS there is shown a wonderful depression in the Iron Trade. The production of Anthracite Coal is placed at about twenty-one million tons, or about two millions more than in 1876.

Sir Walter Scott. By Richard H. Hutton. pp. viii., 177. 1878.

This is one of the series of "English Men of Letters," edited by John Morley. Already arrangements have been made for quite a number of the subjects, and the series will no doubt become popular. Of Scott there has been, we believe, no good life written except that by Lockhart, and this was too voluminous for general reading. Many who have admired the writings of Scott, and others who know little of his writings, but have heard of the man, will be glad to have this brief but comprehensive memoir. The author acknowledges his great indebtedness to Lockhart, and claims little merit beyond that of presenting in a readable form the most interesting features of a very wonderful character and career. The name of Scott, like that of Shakspeare, is familiar to almost every ear, and yet few know much of his life. This volume will serve to acquaint them with one whose

name has been thus familiar. The volumes of this series are brought out by the well known publishers in a neat and attractive dress. We can safely predict for the series a high degree of popularity, as they will furnish reading of a very interesting and instructive character. The greatest names in English literature, with what they have done, will be brought before this generation for its study and admiration. It will do much to cultivate the taste, as well as afford pleasure to the reading public, now happily enlarged and constantly enlarging.

J. FRED'K SMITH, PHILADELPHIA.

Lutheran Monographs. A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession: By Charles P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D. A Question of Latinity, by Henry E. Jacobs, D. D. pp. 120. 1878.

Pamphlets of the size of this one do not ordinarily receive extended notice in the REVIEW. A few sentences are all that is usually deemed necessary or proper. But no apology need be offered, in this case, for a departure from the common rule, in bestowing on this new candidate for public favor some special attention. The character of this publication might indeed justify any respectable journal in passing it by in silence. We are not bound to take any notice of personal defamation or scurrilous abuse; but as this pamphlet has been sent to the REVIEW, thus inviting criticism, we shall not shrink from the responsibility imposed upon us. We confess to a feeling of humiliation in being called upon to perform this duty; not because of any supposed injury our character may have sustained, or discomfiture experienced in fair discussion, but to be compelled to notice the exhibition which the authors have made of themselves. Consulting our personal feelings and self-respect, we should prefer to leave it quietly to find its way to a dishonored grave. But a conviction of duty is sometimes stronger than personal feelings, and we yield ourselves to the unwelcome task.

Our readers can bear witness that the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY has not been made the vehicle of forwarding personal interests, or of seeking personal reputation; but has been open to free discussion on all the great interests of sound learning and religion; and it is hoped it will not be regarded as an abuse of privilege, or thrusting upon them an unwelcome subject, if we occupy some space in noticing this bitter personal assault, as well as this new and labored effort to bolster up a doubtful cause.

This pamphlet, as will be seen by its title, consists of two parts, by two well-known writers in the Lutheran Church—"A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession, by Charles P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D.," and "A Question of Latinity, by Henry E. Jacobs, D. D." Another division, especially of the former part, might be conveniently made into that of the citation of authorities, and that of personal denunciation and

abuse. Of neither is there anything specially new or original. The "Chronicle" may be interesting and valuable to those who are not acquainted with the original authorities, and who may desire to see what can be presented in favor of the particular view of the author; the other part will show that Dr. Krauth has considerable ability in the way of invective and vituperation. He shows himself a greater master in invective than in logic, and whatever may be thought of his proofs and his reasoning, no one who reads this publication can doubt that he may fairly claim the palm for excelling in scurrilous abuse of his opponents. We shall make no attempt to contest with him for the honors in this field.

In some respects this pamphlet is a very remarkable one; or its authors have performed a very remarkable work in its preparation. They affect to treat with the greatest contempt the criticisms made in this REVIEW on the positions they have assumed and maintained. They speak of what we have written on the subject as if it had neither learning nor sense. And yet they have gone to the trouble of writing and publishing an hundred and twenty pages, to disprove what is so puerile, and in an attempt to pour ridicule upon the presumptuous offender. Dr. Krauth says: "HE (the writer) HAS BEEN TRYING TO SHOOT OUR PICKETS, BUT HAS NEVER COME WITHIN SIGHT OF OUR LINES." He professes to regard it with as much scorn as when the great Goliath said, "AM I A DOG, THAT THOU COMEST TO ME WITH STAVES?" And yet he seems to have been so alarmed or disturbed at this picket firing, that he summoned to his support his trusted aid-de-camp, Dr. Jacobs, and they have occupied themselves nearly six months in strengthening their lines, and then, with their works fairly bristling with the sight of the names of old Lutheran heroes, and a huge display of Latinity, drawn from the magazines of grammars, lexicons, and approved manuals, they have boldly ventured to fire in reply this hundred and twenty pounder. It is quite strange that such confident and courageous soldiers, so securely entrenched within their lines, should have deemed it worth while to return mere picket-firing after this fashion. That our readers may have some idea of the dignified character and classic English of the rhetorical part of this pamphlet, we transcribe a brief extract for their benefit.

"Dr. Brown writes habitually in a vein which excludes him from all right to courtesy. Years ago we discovered that to an obstinacy which declined to learn and an ignorance which made him incapable of teaching, he added a dishonesty in citation and a coarseness of imputation which deprived him of all right to notice; and we ceased to notice him. We hoped that the Diet would mark the beginning of a new era with him; but his review shows that he is beyond change. If he thought that the crime of being a member of an ecclesiastical body, which he helped to drive from the one of which he is a special incubus, absolved him from the duty of decency to ourselves, he might at least have treated with the ordinary courtesy which one who claims to be a

gentleman extends to another. Dr. Conrad, who has long been one of the greatest powers in the General Synod, and who has done as much to build up the Seminary which feeds Dr. Brown as Dr. Brown has done to pull it down."

Comment on such language is deemed unnecessary. Coming from a Professor in a Theological Seminary, and a Vice-Provost in the University of Pennsylvania, it is sincerely to be hoped that the students in neither of these Institutions will be ambitious to imitate their distinguished professor.

Besides "the ordinary courtesy which one who claims to be a gentleman extends to another," there were perhaps special reasons why Dr. Krauth should have hesitated to embark in this wholesale and bitter denunciation. We happen both of us to be professors in Theological Seminaries, engaged in the same general work of the Church. The Seminary in which Dr. Krauth serves was established in opposition to that of the General Synod, in which it is our privilege to labor. Chivalry, if not Christianity, would suggest an honorable bearing towards a co-laborer, in a common cause, however differing in their views on some points. But almost from the day of our election and entrance upon duty in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, Dr. Krauth has continued to heap abuse on us and the Seminary. For no cause that we know of, except that the Board of Directors were pleased to call us to this post of duty and that we did not feel free to decline it—and this in Dr. Krauth's judgment seems to have been an unpardonable offence—we have been subjected to this treatment. The presence of his own aged father, as professor in the Seminary, did not restrain him from his attacks upon the Institution, and his attempts to "pull it down;" and when unable longer to hold with comfort a pen, at the request of that venerable man, we had to defend the Seminary against these unnatural assaults from such a source. It is with no gratification that we record such things, but we do not regard it as a Christian duty to endure such abuse, without letting our readers know it is but a repetition of what Dr. Krauth has been doing for years.

We are glad that Dr. Krauth has done this tardy justice to the merits of Dr. Conrad. It may be some atonement for his treatment of him through many former years. No one can appreciate more highly than ourselves the generous and self-sacrificing labors of Dr. Conrad in behalf of the General Synod, and its Theological Seminary; nor have we any serious apprehensions that this attempt to alienate him from the objects of his life-long devotion will be very successful. We are willing to leave to the generosity and true nobility of Dr. Conrad's nature, to determine who has done him the wrong, if any has been done, in this controversy—the man who, boasting his great reputation and careful scholarship, by false assurances led him to

make and afterwards persist in a blunder, or one who pointed out that blunder with the real and responsible author of it. Dr. Krauth owes to Dr. Conrad the humblest apology for having thus deceived and betrayed him into error, even when cautioned of his danger, instead of attempting, by abuse, to divert attention from his own misconduct. If Dr. Conrad deems that we have, in any way, done him a wrong or injustice, we stand ready to apologize to him—but it is simply an impertinence for Dr. Krauth to intermeddle between Dr. Conrad and ourselves, and attempt to tell his readers what we owe to each other as gentlemen. We may not choose to accept Dr. Krauth, especially since this last display of his taste, as an instructor in the department of gentlemanly deportment. We claim no special merit for ourselves, beyond a simple endeavor to do our duty; but we are happy to inform all who care to know the truth, that, in spite of Dr. Krauth's slanderous accusations, the Theological Seminary of the General Synod has never enjoyed a greater measure of prosperity than for the past ten years, during which it has been our privilege to labor in its behalf in training young men for the ministry of the Gospel.

We regret that Dr. Jacobs has given his name to a publication so unworthy of his position and character. He may consider himself justified in the part he has taken, by our reference to him in the April number of the *REVIEW*. But we submit that that brief reference was not only respectful, but eminently courteous, and whether his treatment of us is so or not, we are willing to leave to all impartial judges. It is true that his own part of this pamphlet is free from anything abusive, but his hearty endorsement of Dr. Krauth's part as a "complete vindication," as well as uniting in this joint publication, makes him responsible for his full share of the work. Dr. Jacobs has before him, we hope, many years of honorable and useful service in the Church, but such efforts will not add to his reputation as a scholar or a divine. If his life is spared, he may find cause to regret that he has allowed himself to be used in the effort to blacken the reputation of one who has always maintained to him the most friendly attitude.

So far as we are personally concerned, we do not wish to be understood as at all objecting to the style of discussion adopted by Drs. Krauth and Jacobs. They have a right to choose their own weapons of attack and defence. If a man in a controversy thinks he can use a bludgeon with more effect than he can arguments, he is at liberty to make his choice. Others will judge of his character as a disputant. If these two Doctors prefer the style common to a very different class of men, they are welcome to their method and their glory. Dr. Krauth's temper and manner, in this discussion, are so fitly described by Archbishop Trench, in words applied to another, that we are tempted to quote them. "He scolds like an angry woman. * * He cannot

conceive of any opposing or even disagreeing with him, except as impelled to this by ignorance, or dishonesty, or personal malice."

This pamphlet contains a number of personal matters, which must claim a brief attention before we proceed to review the real points at issue in the discussion. Dr. Krauth labors to make the impression, that we have been guilty of unfairness in the speeches we furnished for publication in the proceedings of the Diet—presenting "a new issue," a "FICTITIOUS AFTER-THOUGHT"—and of violating our honor in making use of the proof of a forth-coming book which we were permitted to see in strict confidence. To us it is surprising that the Secretary of the late Diet, Dr. Jacobs, could allow his name to go on a publication containing such charges. All of the essays and speeches to which we made any reply, were voluntarily submitted to us by the Secretary, without our asking. Some of them were found to be so altered as to require a modification, or complete change, of what we said in the Diet. Dr. Conrad's essay, according to Dr. Krauth himself, was revised, and in a large measure re-written. Under the guidance of Dr. Krauth, and relying on his authorities, Dr. Conrad presented the matter at issue quite differently from what he had done in the Diet. Our challenge we made to suit the altered statement of Dr. Conrad, and Dr. Krauth saw it; and he and Dr. Conrad made their reply. In this case, as in every other in these proceedings, we read to Dr. Jacobs, in his own study, every word that we had written, and requested him to make objection, if in anything we had gone beyond the bounds of propriety or the facts in the case. Over and over was Dr. Jacobs asked to make any objections. He not only endorsed what we wrote as fair and truthful, but assured us that he would allow us wider liberty if we chose to use it. Not one word from us went into print in those proceedings without the expressed assent and endorsement of Dr. Jacobs. There was no "STRICT CONFIDENCE" at all in seeing the proof. We were requested to see it, and part of it, and the very part in question, we were told we could take and need not return, and it is now in a pigeon-hole on our study table. So much did we violate our honor, and we are willing that others shall judge with whom the "question of honor" properly belongs.

Along with this may be mentioned the repetition of stale slanders attempted a dozen years ago. Dr. Krauth seems to have forgotten what he ought to have remembered. He repeats his statement about the translation of *EXHIBEANTUR*, although he was informed at the time that the translation was not ours, but was appropriated from the current English translation of the Book of Concord, as revised by Drs. C. F. Schaeffer, C. P. Krauth, Sen., and others. Both in regard to this and the translation of 'begiessen,' if we were to imitate Dr. Krauth, we would say that "he deliberately writes what he knows to be untrue."

Even if the translation of EXHIBEANTUR had been our own, a small degree of modesty would have constrained silence on the part of one, who had most ludicrously blundered, and kept on blundering, in his "CAREFULLY REVISED" translation of a plain sentence in the Preface to the Augsburg Confession, as prepared for Dr. Schaff's great work—"The Creeds of Christendom." When Dr. Krauth has acquired a mastery of Latin sufficient to preserve him from mistaking a future for a past tense, and to distinguish between the verbs "comparo" and "compareo," he can better afford to attempt sneering at the alleged errors of others. Meanwhile we advise him, when tempted to take on such airs, to just remember that "carefully revised" translation of his, that we happen to know so chagrined his friend Dr. Schaff, as well as called forth the biting criticism of that "scurrilous Romish writer," in the "American Catholic Quarterly Review."

Dr. Krauth has been successful in detecting a slip in our article in the April number of the REVIEW, and it seems to have afforded him infinite merriment. He plays with it through several pages, and illustrates the character of a great and learned critic. We spoke of the suite of the Elector, not thinking of excluding the Elector himself, as embracing more than half of the princes who signed the Augsburg Confession. We unhesitatingly admit the blunder. Of course the suite of the Elector did not include the Elector, and of course three are not more than the half of seven. But as in our mind we included the Elector, and the Elector with his suite made four of the princes, this is more than half of seven. We stand corrected, and acknowledge our indebtedness to Dr. Krauth for pointing out our error, nor would we deprive him of the gain he seeks to make out of so small capital. We will not even avail ourselves of the plea which he puts in for some of his own most unfortunate blunders—"Mental preoccupation, temporary languor from overstrained attention, or loss of rest, and other causes of a similar nature, account for the familiar fact that great scholars have made mistakes of which they were heartily ashamed, mistakes which an intelligent school-boy put upon his guard, could not make, and with his attention quickened, would at once detect." We will not, we repeat, avail ourselves of this plea which Dr. Krauth puts in on behalf of "great scholars" like himself. He may ascribe it to our invincible "ignorance," which does not know that a man is not included in his own suite, and that three is not more than the half of seven. It is a happy thing for Dr. Krauth that he was able to detect this blunder. We have no defence to offer. We know that sometimes a man's family is made to include himself, and we recently noticed one of our most careful and vigorous newspaper editors making a similar blunder. It might even be said that the Greeks had a common idiom somewhat of this character. But we were not wri-

ting Greek, and we confess our careless use of the English language in this case.

Dr. Krauth, with a grandeur of thought that spurns little things, has detected another serious error in our article. He quietly informs his readers that we probably mean by "where—from," what writers of English usually express by the word "whence." The Doctor is no doubt right, according to the best old English authorities, though he exposed himself to the ridicule of a reviewer sometime since for his pretences in this particular. It may abate the shock to his keen sense of any violation of the good old English, as well as mitigate the heinousness of our offending, to let him know that this form of expression has become rather common in colloquial English, and is not unknown even in respectable journals. Since this sagacious criticism, we have noticed it in two leading papers in the city of Philadelphia—the "Press," and the "National Baptist"—and could furnish scores of illustrations from them and other publications. Still, we are glad, that Dr. Krauth has called attention to this alleged inelegance of style, as it shows that however overstrained he was, when preparing his own work, leading him sadly to blunder both in translations and dates, he now has leisure to attend to the smallest matters.

Dr. Jacobs presents us as charging him with 'going out of the way to attack the REVIEW.' We are not aware of having made any such charge. He gives his own version of the matter, and without questioning its truthfulness, we may be permitted to present ours. After the publication of the "Conservative Reformation," and a tolerably lengthy notice of it, in the following July number of the REVIEW, Dr. Jacobs did proffer to one of the Editors of that Quarterly a review of the work, notwithstanding the "great care and anxiety," to which he refers. This proffer was deliberately considered by the editors, and Dr. Jacobs was informed, in substance, that the REVIEW would be freely open to him for an article on any subject discussed in the 'Conservative Reformation, and that he could draw freely upon that work in his discussion of it, but that the department of book reviewing was in the hands of the editors, and that it had already been attended to. He was understood at the time to acquiesce in the justness of the decision. His review appeared in the October number of the 'Mercersburg Review,' and was spoken of at the time as designed to offset some of the strictures in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. Dr. Jacobs says he has "no recollection whatever of any strictures of the REVIEW which were in mind, when the notice referred to was written." We accept his statement as true, according to his "recollection;" but are constrained to add, that it looks like what he calls "a mere quibble," when he informs his readers that in 'his copy he finds the pages containing the strictures uncut; but

confesses he was "not unacquainted" with the strictures, from other sources.

So far as we have noticed, there is but a single point in which Drs. Krauth and Jacobs seem to differ—and this confessedly a point of very little importance. It is entirely personal and concerns their estimate of ourselves. Dr. Krauth's favorite charge is that of "IGNORANCE." He seems never to tire in repeating the word, and it serves both the lack of proof and to meet every objection or difficulty on his part. He would hardly know what to do had he not this ready relief. But Dr. Jacobs is pleased to speak of us as a "SCHOLAR OF ACKNOWLEDGED INTELLIGENCE." It may puzzle the readers of this "Lutheran Monograph" which to believe, Dr. Krauth or Dr. Jacobs. Possibly Dr. Jacobs intends his to be understood ironically, as he aims to be ironical in his criticism; or, possibly, on "a review of the entire subject," he may be "led to a detection of the error," and thus harmonize his view with that of Dr. Krauth. We have pointed out the apparent discrepancy that our readers may have the benefit of both views. Of course it is to us immaterial which of these authorities they may prefer to follow.

Having disposed of these personal matters, and to which perhaps too much time and space have been given, we now come to the more important part of this pamphlet—the proof it furnishes in support of Dr. Krauth's theory.

We have searched in vain through these one hundred and twenty pages for any additional proof or new arguments. The old matter is rehashed, with a prodigious display of authorities that prove just nothing to the point, and a discussion of *LATINITY* which shows that Dr. Jacobs can more readily compile from grammars and dictionaries, than he can discover the plainest matters of fact in the case.

So far as Melancthon's letter of May 22d is concerned, it seems scarcely worth while to recur to it again, and we would not, did not Dr. Krauth's persistence make it necessary. We showed in the April number of the *REVIEW*, that even if this letter had been sent to Luther, and received by him, and an answer returned, it would not at all prove what is claimed—not even a second sending of the Augsburg Confession. All that Melancthon requests Luther to do, is to run over the *ARTICULOS FIDEI*, article of faith, and expressly excepts the other part of the Confession from his examination at that time—saying, "the remaining part (*reliqua*) we will treat as we may be able." The *ARTICULOS FIDEI*, which Melancthon asks Luther to run over, according to Dr. Krauth, are about "in the ratio of six to twenty-six;" so that it is less than one fourth of the whole Confession that Luther is requested to re-examine. How this proves even a sending of *THE CONFESSION*—the whole Confession—much less, as has been affirmed, 'Luther's unqualified approval of it,' must puzzle even Dr.

Krauth to show. If some one were asked to read over the New Testament, would that prove that the whole Bible had been sent, read, and approved? Or if some one were requested to run over the Pentateuch, would this prove the sending of the whole of the Old Testament; and that it was examined and returned with approval? And yet this is substantially the logic employed to prove a second sending of the Confession to Luther, and his examination of it—a request of Melancthon that he would run over less than one fourth of it, and that one fourth a separate and distinct part from the remaining portion. On such proof Dr. Krauth proposes to annihilate all objections, and even brand with “complete ignorance and effrontery” the refusal to accept his “demonstration.”

But Dr. Krauth has not even proved, as he alleges, the “second SENDING” by Melancthon and the “second reception” by Luther, prior to the Diet of Augsburg. The only additional evidence adduced, we believe, is the letter of Luther to Melancthon on the 29th of June, four days after the Diet. In this he refers to “THE PICTURE OF VIENNA,” which Melancthon, in his letter of May 22d, wrote about sending. But if this letter of Luther, June 29th, proves so much, another letter of Melancthon, still four days later, July 3d, will prove more. Melancthon in this letter, written to Veit Dietrich, who was with Luther, wants to know whether Luther has received this picture—*utrum Doctor acceperit depictam Viennæ obsidionem, quam ei misi*. He expresses his suspicion that the messenger may have sold it: *suspicio nuncium vendisse*. Now it is plain, beyond a doubt, that up to this time, July 3d, eight days after the presentation of the Confession at the Diet, Melancthon knew nothing of Luther’s having received the picture: and this is strong evidence that he at least had no knowledge of Luther’s receiving the letter of the 22d of May, in which he tells Luther that he is sending him this picture. Dr. Krauth indeed tells us, that “Luther often does not answer the particular points of a letter.” This is a very easy way of explaining his silence for six weeks, if he received that letter “without any serious delay.” Dr. Krauth says: “HIS SILENCE WAS HIS ANSWER!” That is Dr. Krauth’s way of meeting a difficulty. He says indeed, that “Dr. Brown admits the sending.” We admit nothing of the kind, simply because we lack the evidence on which to rest a satisfactory belief. This letter of Melancthon is entirely insufficient to prove the point for which it is cited.

It is plain that the whole case of a further sending the Confession to Luther, before the Diet, rests upon this passage of Melancthon. Its importance is insisted on by both Dr. Krauth and Dr. Jacobs, and they have made use of every endeavor to support their interpretation of Melancthon’s language. They assume that Melancthon gave it

as a kind of dying testimony for this very purpose, and that every word must be viewed as testimony in a court of inquiry. Dr. Jacobs devotes thirty pages of criticism to show that Dr. Krauth has hit upon the true and only meaning. We shall not ask our readers to traverse this dreary wilderness of learned criticism. By the process Dr. Jacobs has employed, almost any thing can be proved in regard to the meaning of Latin words. Happily, in this case, we can submit their interpretation to another ordeal, and, without so much learned display, show its absurdity and utter untenability. Dr. Jacobs has treated his readers to a display of learned authorities, and cited some of the canons of hermeneutics. There is one very simple canon which he has forgotten or overlooked—although it is a fundamental one—the canon of common sense. We propose to subject this translation and learned criticism to this test, and to show that they will not stand such an ordeal.

Dr. Jacobs insists that "*de singulis sententiis*" must here mean "sentence by sentence," or as he explains, "concerning sentence by sentence," or "concerning the sentences one at a time," or "concerning each sentence taken separately." To thus sustain Dr. Krauth, he is compelled to confess his own error in translating the words a year ago. To confess an error when convinced of it, marks a candid mind, but a confession of error may be evidence of something else, and our readers must judge for themselves in this case.

Dr. Jacobs feels constrained to "beg pardon for referring to a very elementary principle" in discussing the construction of *DISPUTATUM EST*. The design of this is very manifest—to suggest that "critics of the school which the article in the *REVIEW* represents," know nothing beyond the elements of Latin Grammar! It would have been well for Dr. Jacobs, if he had either not made such a suggestion, or had not in himself furnished such an illustration of this school of critics. Could anything be more "elementary," than when Dr. Jacobs parades from the dictionary the etymology of *DISPUTO*, to determine its meaning? For the benefit of beginners in Latin we give it: "*DIS* No. II. A., 3 b.) and *PUTO* (No. II. a.)" "*PUTO*—clear up, set in order, arrange, settle, adjust." "*Dis*, of computation *SEVERALLY, ONE AFTER ANOTHER*" Now this is to settle the meaning of the word in the middle of the sixteenth century, after it had been in use two thousand years. We quote for the benefit of our critic a very simple and plain statement, made by Dr. S. S. Haldeman, an acknowledged authority, a short time ago in a newspaper article. "A mistake is often made in taking the etymology of a word as a guide to its current meaning." This is too obvious to need illustrating, and yet Dr. Jacobs has, in his very elementary criticism, overlooked so simple a principle. He further says: "We frankly acknowledge that at first we also had some doubt concerning the legitimacy of the words:

"and determined" that follow "discussed." But armed with grammars and lexicons, he goes bravely to work, soon puts to flight his "doubt," and reaches the desired conclusion. It might be interesting to try this meaning by a few familiar passages of Melancthon's own Latin, instead of that from grammars and lexicons. In the well known letter of May 22, Melancthon says: *Nunc de potestate clavium etiam disputo*—"I am just now discussing [and determining upon] the Power of the Keys." In two letters, June 19th, to which we shall have occasion to refer again, he uses *DISPUTATUM EST*, in regard to the forbidding of the Protestant theologians to preach. *De ea re toto triduo disputatum est: Hac de re postea diebus tribus disputatum est*: "concerning this matter they discussed [and determined upon] three whole days." It is a little in the way of this interpretation of Melancthon's Latin, that in both these cases he expressly adds, that afterwards, "it was determined," *decursum est eo*. In the letter of June 11th, Melancthon uses *disputatio*, as *prolixas disputationes*, and it would be simply amusing to give it the meaning of these critics.

One other special point of Dr. Jacobs' criticism we must notice. He says: "The more we consider the objection thus made concerning the *TOTA*, the more we are astonished that it should ever have been raised by a scholar of the acknowledged intelligence of the critic." The astonishment of Dr. Jacobs cannot be greater than our own, that he should thus attempt to support Dr. Krauth's argument based on his translation of *TOTA*. Dr. Krauth's argument required a certain use of *TOTA*; we denied that this meaning was necessary, or even the strict meaning of the word, and this excites the astonishment of our critic. We choose to meet his astonishment by the expression of our own. But he is not satisfied with this. He supposes that we meant to make an attack somewhere, and mistook the word—"FORMA was marked as the vulnerable point, and then by some inexplicable confusion the point of attack was transferred to the *TOTA*." Now we are compelled to tell Dr. Jacobs plainly, that we do not know of anything in his superior talents or attainments that warrants him in any such imputations to us. He must not suppose that because Dr. Krauth allows himself to indulge so freely in the charge of "ignorance," and flatters him with "having a distinguished reputation as a Latin scholar," that therefore he can indulge in such criticisms with impunity. If he desires illustrations of "inexplicable confusion" in dealing with Latin, we will furnish enough from his own translations. At present we forbear, but admonish Dr. Jacobs that it may not be wise for him to indulge in that style of criticism. We have no desire to depreciate his attainments in Latin, but they are not such as to warrant the liberties he has ventured to take, and we cannot help distinctly telling him so.

We now submit their translation and exposition to the proposed ordeal. It is alleged that according to Melancthon's Latin, the Confession was "discussed and determined upon in regular course, sentence by sentence," or as Dr. Jacobs explains, "each sentence taken separately,"—"a minute analysis of the entire document, taking into the account, one after another, all its items, together with the reasons that could be cited on both sides, in order to attain a clear and fixed form."

Now it is very obvious that such a process would require time. It took two full hours to read the Confession, without any delays or interruptions. According to the ordinary numbering of sections or paragraphs in the Augsburg Confession, there are four hundred and forty. The number of sentences is somewhat less. Separate and full discussion, such as is claimed, on each sentence, would take at the very least some days, if not weeks. It could not be done in a few hours, for it took two hours simply to read the Confession without discussion. Well, when was this done? We now ask our readers to consider a plain simple question of facts, apart from any strained interpretation of words.

Dr. Krauth cites authority to show that the German Formula was submitted to the Orders, "JUNE 14th, AND AFTER THIS COMES THE DISCUSSION MENTIONED BY MELANCHTHON." (p. 61). This will serve as a starting point. The Princes and others met the next morning, June 15th, at 5 o'clock, to arrange for the reception of the Emperor, who was to enter Augsburg that day. After the necessary preparation, they proceeded out of the city to meet him, and in the evening all marched into the city in grand procession. From five o'clock in the morning until near midnight, they were thus engaged on the 15th. This is an historical fact that will not be disputed. This was Wednesday. Almost immediately on entering the city, the Emperor interdicted the preaching by the Protestant theologians. This produced great excitement on the Protestant side. The Emperor also demanded that they should join next day, the 16th, in celebrating the festival of Corpus Christi. The excitement was so great that some were called up during the night to confer about it. Early next morning the Princes met, the Elector, being too unwell to attend, was represented by his son John Frederick. They determined that they would not be present in the procession of Corpus Christi. For three whole days they now discuss the subject of preaching by the Protestant theologians. This was the 16th, 17th, and 18th, or Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. Of this we have the most definite and positive proof. We have two letters of Melancthon, (Corp. Ref. II., 730, 731), one to Myconius and the other to Luther, written on the 19th. In the former he writes: *De ea re toto triduo disputatum est*—as Drs. Krauth and Jacobs claim, they discussed and determined upon this matter three WHOLE or COMPLETE days. In the latter nearly the

same : *Hac de re postea diebus tribus disputatum est. Neque enim statim desierunt nostri concionari. Tandem post longam decertationem decursum est eo, etc.* There is also a letter of Brentius to Isenmann on the same day, and one from the Nuremberg legates to the Senate of Nuremberg. From these documents, especially from the letters of Melancthon, we learn that there had been no time for any discussion of the Confession between the 15th and 19th of June. The whole of these four days, the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th, had been fully occupied with other matters. The 19th was Sunday. Now here we might safely rest the whole case, without further proof or argument ; as between Sunday, the 19th, and Saturday the 25th, the day on which the Confession was read in the Diet, there was absolutely not time for this minute discussion, "sentence by sentence," and the sending of the Confession to Luther, his reading it and writing to the Princes his approval—all before its presentation. Dr. Krauth, several times in his discussion, makes four days the time for a courier to pass between Augsburg and Coburg, or eight days to go and come ; and there is less than six days between Sunday the 19th and the time of the reading of the Confession. Where is the time for this minute, protracted discussion and determining upon the Confession, "sentence by sentence," between the 14th and the 25th. We have shown that up to the 19th there was absolutely no time for this discussion, and that after that, the period was too short, even if there were nothing in the way.

But there are still additional difficulties to be considered. The Diet was formally opened on Monday the 20th, and this now occupied most of the time. Day by day grave and exciting matters engaged their attention. On Wednesday, the 22d, the Emperor demanded that the Confession be presented on Friday the 24th. The Protestant Princes begged for time, as it was not yet ready and they had no clean copy. The Emperor refused the time requested, and the Princes met on the 23d, read over the Confession, and signed it. So that between the 18th, and the signing of the Confession, were only four days. Or, allowing only six days, two less than the ordinary time, according to Dr. Krauth, for sending the Confession and getting it back again, before its presentation, with no time for Luther to examine it, and it must have been sent as early as Sunday the 19th. But between the 14th and 19th there was no time, as has been shown, for this discussion of Dr. Krauth and Dr. Jacobs. So that unless Dr. Jacobs can by a miracle create time or annihilate space, it is certain that the time was too short, and the distance too great, to admit of that "sentence by sentence" "discussion and determining upon," and that sending of the Confession afterwards to Luther, and his reading it, and writing to the Princes his approval. We believe it is a demonstrable, and demonstrated, impossibility to have been done, as Dr. Krauth main-

tains, between the 14th and the 25th of June : and Dr. Jacobs' thirty pages of *LATINITY*, in the presence of stern facts, are like so much chaff before the wind. Words may be manipulated to mean almost anything, but facts are not so easily managed. This plain statement of facts, sustained as they are by unquestionable proofs, ought to satisfy any candid mind as to this minute and prolonged discussion of the Confession, between the 14th and 19th of June, and the sending of it to Luther, and its return after a re-examination, before the reading of it at the Diet, June 25th.

But we have other proofs to show the untenability of this theory.

The Confession was not yet finished on the 19th : that is, "COMPLETE" or "FINISHED" in the sense that these critics insist on assigning to "TOTAL." We have the writing of the legates of Nuremberg, (Corp. Ref. II. 728) to prove this. Bretschneider, who has carefully traced the successive stages in the completion of the Confession, in the 26th Volume of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, expressly says : *Etiam d. 19. Jun. Confessio nondum fuit finita, etc.*—"Even on the 19th day of June the Confession was not completed." In proof of his statement he cites this writing of the Nuremberg legates of June 19th. We have thus the express testimony of these legates, on the ground, that the Confession was not finished on the 19th, testimony that cannot be questioned—and after the 19th, there was not time to complete and send it to Luther and have it back before the 25th, or in time for the Diet. This testimony of the Confession not being finished on the 19th, let it be observed, is that of men living at the time, and not as the bulk of Dr. Krauth's witnesses, men who lived from one to three centuries later, and whose testimony is simply their individual opinions. If it be true, as these Nuremberg legates declare, and Bretschneider repeats, with additional proof, (Corp. Ref. XXVI., 209), that the Confession was not finished on the 19th of June, then it is clear again, that the time is too short to finish it, and send it to Luther, and get his answer, unless all this could be done in a little more than six day. But as we know from other testimony already given, there had yet been no time for that discussion, so much insisted on by Dr. Krauth, and by Dr. Jacobs in his ponderous *Latinity*, the argument is conclusive against their interpretation and application of Melancthon's words. It may be a pity thus to spoil Dr. Krauth's wonderful array of authorities, and Dr. Jacobs' equally wonderful *Latinity*, but we venture to say that it is a clear case of a *reductio ad absurdum*.

Besides what has been proved by testimony that cannot be impeached or set aside, we have very strong collateral evidence against the theory of Drs. Krauth and Jacobs, in interpreting Melancthon's Latin. Melancthon may be presumed to be reasonably self-consistent, or not to have meant in this passage what would present himself as acting elsewhere an almost childish and silly part. The Confession was read

before the Diet on the 25th of June. The very next day, Melancthon sends it to Luther to be read : and the next day already, the 27th, writes to Veit Dietrich, asking to know Luther's opinion about it—*Doctoris judicium mihi rescribere*. With manifest anxiety and impatience to know how Luther would like it, he writes again to Veit Dietrich, only three days later, June 30th, and says, "I desire to know what the Doctor thinks of the Confession"—*Scire cupio * * Doctor * * judicaverit περί τῆς ἀπολογίας*. Dr. Krauth says : "That Melancthon should think it necessary to ask Luther, in a letter which could not reach him earlier than May 26th, to run over an urgent document which had been sent him May 11, is preposterous." He thinks "it is hardly necessary to point out the intrinsic absurdity of the supposition" that Melancthon would ask Luther to look over the same Confession so soon. Would it not be equally "preposterous," and prove alike "intrinsic absurdity," for Melancthon to show so much anxiety, and to write twice in a few days, to know Luther's judgment of the Confession, if Luther, after it was entirely completed, and just before its presentation in the Diet, had written "to the Princes, that he had both read the (Dr. Krauth says, "literally this—hanc") Confession, and approved it?" Is it reasonable that Melancthon would have thus written, if he knew that Luther had signified his approval in writing only a few days before ? Or is it likely that Melancthon could have meant to write in 1560, what would have proved his conduct so preposterous and absurd in 1530 ? We are willing now to leave this QUESTION OF LATINITY, with the interpretation and application of Melancthon's language, to the intelligence and candor of our readers.

After all the pretentious boasting of Dr. Krauth, as to what he and Dr. Jacobs have achieved in this "Lutheran Monograph," piling proof upon proof, and literally overwhelming all opposition, until he affects to treat with scornful pity and contempt both ourselves and the "Lutheran and Missionary," he is compelled, before closing, to make a humiliating confession of the utter weakness of his case—a most pitiable acknowledgment that he has not one particle of actual testimony to prove what he has been so elaborately and boastfully attempting. He says : "There may have been a special arrangement by which Luther was reached and heard from in this particular crisis, with an extraordinary degree of promptness. Such a communication would of course be guarded with special caution !" "OF COURSE," and there might have been a special train, or the whole text of the Confession might have been telegraphed to Luther. The only difficulty is, we have no evidence of railroads or telegraphs at that time, and just as little evidence of any "special arrangement" for "an extraordinary degree of promptness."

Again he says : "In sending it to Luther after the gathering of the

Estates, with the Emperor, special precautions could be employed. It would not go openly with the ordinary correspondence through the common couriers. All allusions, in letter, which could give a hint of the sending, or a clue to it, could be avoided. The obligation of secrecy on the part of all involved, would be made very strict. The reasons for making it a secret then, would be of force, for keeping it a secret, and it is with the air of imparting something secret hitherto, that Melancthon puts forth his statement years afterwards ! ! ! " Whew ! This is a confession, wrung out under pretence of furnishing proof, that in all that generation there was not any "HINT OF THE SENDING, OR A CLUE TO IT." Nobody knew of it, or spoke of it, or wrote of it. It was a profound "SECRET," and remained so for thirty years, without any conceivable reason for the secrecy, beyond the immediate occasion of sending, if even then. Why this particular sending was kept so secret, and no other one, that of the 11th of May, the alleged one of the 22nd of May, and Melancthon's the very day after the Diet, is as great a "SECRET," or inscrutable mystery, as the sending itself. This, if not a "descent from the sublime to the ridiculous," is a descent from the grave to the comical. It is the lamest conclusion ever added to what was designated to be a great argument.

"O, most lame and impotent conclusion !"

For the benefit of our readers we will briefly state a few facts implied in Dr. Krauth's Confession, or capable of proof.

1. Of all who were present at the Diet of Augsburg, or participated in the discussions on the Confession, there is not a single witness to this sending of it to Luther.

2. Luther himself, who lived nearly sixteen years after the Diet, never alludes in any of his writings to this sending.

3. Melancthon, who lived nearly thirty years after the Diet, nowhere alludes to it—leaving out of question this disputed passage.

4. No historian of the Diet, or of the Augsburg Confession, of that age, pretends anything of the kind.

5. There is no conceivable reason for such silence, after the Diet was over. The Confession was freely sent to Luther and others, and no secrecy dreamed of.

6. The whole claim of such a sending rests on this single passage of doubtful application, written by Melancthon thirty years after the alleged sending : and such a use of the passage seems to contradict all the probabilities as well as the facts in the case.

We took up this pamphlet expecting to find something new on the subject, but we have been disappointed. Instead of proof we find opinions and assertions, instead of arguments abuse, and instead of trustworthy conclusions imaginary possibilities. We had marked a number of points, in addition to those noticed, for criticism, but have neither time nor space at present. In this review we endeavored to avoid all offensive personalities, and not to return 'railing for railing.' If in any instance there may seem to be harshness or severity, it is the severity of simply stating the truth. The case is now submitted to the calm and sober judgment of the reader.

CONTENTS OF NO. IV.

Article.	Page
<p>I. HOW SHALL WE TRAIN THE MINISTRY FOR THE TIMES, 477</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. JAMES W. RICHARD, Professor in Carthage College, Carthage, Ills.</p>	
<p>II. ANSGAR,..... 501</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">* Translated from the German of Rev. Alexander Michelsen, of Lübeck, by Rev. G. F. BEHRINGER, Indianapolis, Ind.</p>	
<p>III. ASCENSIO ISALÆ,..... 513</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Translated from the critical edition of the Ethiopic text of Prof. Dillmann, by Rev. GEO. H. SCHODDE, A. M., Ph. D., Martin's Ferry, Ohio.</p>	
<p>IV. STUDIES IN GOSPEL HARMONY,..... 538</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. W. H. SETTLEMYER, A. M., Jefferson, Md.</p>	
<p>V. THE POWER OF DARKNESS,..... 550</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. H. L. DOX, Tremont, Pa.</p>	
<p>VI. THE FULNESS OF CHRIST,..... 582</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. N. VAN ALSTINE, Raymertown, N. Y.</p>	
<p>VII. HARTWICK SEMINARY,..... 592</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. WILLIAM HULL, Hudson, N. Y.</p>	

VIII. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,..... 609

AMERICAN.—Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—
Historical and Biographical—Miscellaneous.

BRITISH.—Biblical and Theological—Philosophy and Science—History
and Biography—Miscellaneous.

IX. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,..... 610

Memoirs of Jean Francois Marmontel—Artist Biographies: Titian.
Raphael, Durer, Murillo, Rembrandt, Claude Lorraine, Sir Joshua
Reynolds, Michael Angelo, Guido Reni—Memorial and Biographical
Sketches—The Iliad of Homer—Lectures on Mediæval Church His-
tory—Early Rome—The Student's Ecclesiastical History—Villages
and Village Life—Annual Record of Science and Industry for 1877—
Sir Walter Scott—Lutheran Monographs.

 PERIODICALS.

The "Foreign Quarterlies" and "Blackwood" have reached us reg-
ularly, and have, as usual, been filled with interesting and valuable
articles, covering a wide range of discussion in literature, science,
philosophy, politics, and religion. The various movements agitating
English and European society give to these publications at this time
special interest. "Harper's Magazine" and "The Living Age" con-
tinue to furnish their readers with a rich variety that should please
the most fastidious taste. While there has been less than usual activ-
ity in book publishing, the magazine and review literature seems to
suffer no abatement in quantity or quality.

THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF LONDON, FROM THE FIRST BEGINNING TO THE PRESENT TIME. BY JOHN STOW. THE SECOND EDITION, CORRECTED AND ENLARGED. LONDON, Printed by J. Stow, at the Sign of the Sun in St. Dunstons Church, in the Year 1633.